Duplicate of the last but one.

The Reasonableness of the CHURCH of ENGLANDS

TEST,

And Justness, of Her REFORMATION, *Asserted; In Answer to the*

Bishop of Oxon's

Fallacious, Reasons, and Precarious Assertions against it.

Also, the VVorship of IMAGES, *Adoration of the* HOST, *and Innovation of* SAINTS, *&c.*

Proved

IDOLATRY,

By the Catholick Doctrine of the Holy Scripture, the Ancient Fathers *and all Reformed Churches.*

By which the Writings of Dr. Stillingfleet, *Dr.* Tillotson, *Dr.* Moore, *&c. are Cleared from the Charge of* Anticatholick, Anti-christian, Fanatical, *&c.*

For it was not an Enemy that reproached me, then I could have born it, ---but it was thou a Man mine equal, my guide, and my acquaintance, Psal. 55. v. 12, 13.

Printed in the Year, M DC LXXX VIII.

AMong all the late Diſcourſes I have ſeen, there is none that affords Occaſion of greater Surprize, than that Intitl'd *Reaſons for Abrogating the TEST*, eſpecially if we conſider the Preſent Station of the Author, and his Difference in Opinion, while moving in a Lower Orb, and was labouring for Promotion. As to his preſent Quality, He is well known to be one of the Reputed Fathers of the Church of *England*, or Overſeers of the Flock of *Chriſt*, to preſerve it from all Falſe Doctrine, Hereſie, and Schiſm, *&c.* And therefore it cannot but be admir'd, that a Perſon who owes his Eccleſiaſtical Dignity to the Church of *England*, ſhould ſo meanly Condeſcend, as if he ſaw his Dignity in danger, to plead for *Tranſubſtantiation*, and the Church of *Rome*, againſt the Charge of *Idolatry*, maintain'd as well by all the Reform'd Churches in General, as by that Eſtabliſh'd by Law in theſe His Majeſty's Dominions! Which is no more than to proclaim to all the World, that the Church of which he is at preſent a Conſecrated Biſhop, is a Schiſmatical Church. And this only upon the account of making it an Argument to overthrow the *Teſt*, which debars the *Roman Catholick* Peers from ſitting in Parliament. Now that he ſeems to prove the Church of *England* to be Schiſmatical, in his making good his Argument againſt the *Teſt*, is plain; For he makes it his buſineſs to ſhew you, That *Tranſubſtantiation*, as it is decided by the Council of *Trent*, is a Doctrine which has always been acknowledg'd by the Church of *England*; and that the Church of *Rome* is not guilty of *Idolatry*. Which if true, the Church of *England* can never juſtifie her ſelf in her Separation from the Church of *Rome*. So that even *Varillas* himſelf, could hardly have been ſo diſingenuous as to have obtruded ſuch a Fallacy upon the World.

But we ſhall not further digreſs, but trace our Author, and try on what ſolid Grounds his New Diſcoveries inſiſt.

As to his firſt and ſecond Reaſons, I leave it to the Gentlemen of the Long Robe. Only I thought this old Saying might be inſerted,

Turpius ejicitur quam non admittitur Hoſpes.

As for his Third Reaſon, That this Law is of an Eccleſiaſtical Nature. I cannot conceive how making Acts what Perſons are to be admitted into Places of Truſt, can be of an Eccleſiaſtical Nature. It would ſeem that all Acts of an Eccleſiaſtical Nature, are either for the deciſion of ſome intricate point of Divinity, or for Enjoyning the decent performing of all things belonging to the Worſhip of God, or calling to account Page. 6.

 thoſe

those who are unruly, and walk disorderly, as the Apostle terms it, and Excommunicating such if Obstinate: But none of these can be said in the case of the *Test*. For here was no making of Decrees upon Divine Verities; that is, here was no Discussion of that Controversie of *Transubstantiation* and *Idolatry*, but only the Parliament supposing the *Protestant* Opinion in opposition to it, to have been a Truth received by our Church, and that upon Authority Competent, and continued for above a hundred Years, and that it was the only *Test* to distinguish one of the Church of *Rome* from one of our own Communion, and therefore enjoyned, that none should be admitted to sit in Parliament, or bear any publick Charge, but such as disowned *Transubstantiation*, &c. which is as much as to say, We order that none sit in Parliament, or bear any publick Charge, but such as disowned *Transubstantiation*, *&c.* which is as much as to say, We order that none sit in Parliament, *&c.* but those who are by Profession of the Church of *England* as it is now Established by Law. But this Argument being so Trivial, the very naming of it seems a sufficient Refutal; We therefore proceed to that he insists so much upon, and by which he seems rather to have designed to support the tottering Cause of the Church of *Rome*, than to impugn the *Test*.

Pag. 9. His Fourth Reason why it ought to be Repealed, is, *Because of the Uncertainty and Falshood of the Matters therein contained*: As first, *That there is no Transubstantiation in the Sacrament of our Saviours Body and Blood.* And secondly, *The Invocation of Saints and the Mother of God is Idolatry.*

The Reverend Author follows exactly the Method of those he takes upon him to defend. Which is first to begin to bespatter those whom he alledges were Promoters of the *Test*.

He begins first to shew the Evil of imposing the Abjuration of *Transubstantiation*, and makes a great Bustle to shew the Unreasonableness of imposing an Oath, the Contents whereof are so abstruse, that it is hardly possible for Noblemen especially to come to the understanding of them. And to make his Putt good, he makes a very long Digression on the Notions of the several Schoolmen about *Transubstantiation*; where he ever and anon drops precarious Assertions, to wit, that the Catholick Church in all Ages, maintained the Real and Substantial Presence; but we meet not with any shew of Proof thereof. It seems he thinks the old αὐτὸς ἔφη is enough, that *his* Affirmation is evidence enough to prove the Truth of any thing. One would almost admire what he means in setting down those wild Notions of *Scotists*, *Nominalists*, &c. And indeed it can be with no other design than to confound his Reader; Yet in the end he gives you the Description of *Transubstantiation*, as it is in the 4th Chapter of the 13th. Session of the Council of *Trent*, in these words:

Page 25. "By the Consecration of the Bread and Wine, there is a Conversion of "the whole substance of the Bread into the substance of the Body of "*Christ*, and of the whole substance of the Wine into the substance of his "Blood,

" Blood ; which Converſion is fitly and properly called by the Holy Ca-
" tholick Church, *Tranſubſtantiation.*

Now what moved him to rail ſo much againſt the Impoſers of the *Teſt*, as impoſing Propoſitions which Noblemen could not poſſibly underſtand ? For certainly they muſt be of very mean Capacities who cannot underſtand the Deciſion of that Infallible Church in this affair, and that goes beyond all the particular Notions of Schoolmen, and is the Rule to which they are all to ſubmit. It ſeems our Author has a very mean Opinion of the Nobility, while he ſo confidently averrs, that they neither *do* nor *can* underſtand it. For it is propoſed in as plain and obvious terms as can be, though I confeſs a man muſt put a ſuſpenſion (for that time at leaſt) to Senſe, Reaſon, and Religion, to believe it; and may therefore the eaſilier and ſafelier ſwear againſt it.

He proceeds to give you the Opinions of the ſeveral Communions differing from the Church of *Rome* ; And he firſt begins with the *Lutherans*. But what he ſpeaks as to their Sentiments, we purpoſely wave: Seeing though they differ from the Church of *Rome* in that point, yet their Church differs vaſtly in her Opinion from all other Proteſtant Churches; yet they do not in the leaſt own, that the Bread and Wine are tranſubſubſtantiated into the Body and Blood of *Chriſt*. *Pag.* 28.

Whereas our Author ſays, that the *Helvetian* Miniſters maintained the Real Preſence, we have Inſerted the following paſſage out of their Confeſſion. " We do not then ſo joyn the Body of the Lord and his Blood " with the Bread and Wine, as tho we thought that the Bread is the Bo-" dy of Chriſt more than after a Sacramental manner, or yet that the " Body of Chriſt doth lye hid corporally under the Bread, ſo as it ought " to be worſhipped under the form of Bread, or yet that he that recei-" veth the ſign receiveth alſo the Thing it ſelf. The Body of Chriſt is in " the Heavens, at the right hand of his Father, *&c.* *Pag.* 31. *Helvet. Confeſſ.*

And he affirms, that the *Bohemian Waldenſes declare expreſly, Bread and Wine are the very Body and Blood of Chriſt*. The Reader may pleaſe to take notice of theſe words in their Confeſſion, " Wherefore this Speech, " *Bread is the Body, and Wine is the Blood of Chriſt*, is a Sacramental Speech, " to wit, that theſe two diſtinct things, do remain the ſelf ſame thing " which in their own nature they be, and yet by reaſon of a Sacramental " Union, or Sacramentally, they be that alſo which they ſignifie, and " whereof they do teſtifie——— Now both good and bad uſe this Sa-" crament, yet the true Believers receive it to Life, and the Unbelievers " to Condemnation : And tho both receive it outwardly, yet the Belie-" vers do receive it Spiritually, and ſo to their Salvation. Nothing like, The Bread and Wine are the very Body and Blood of Chriſt here. *Page* 29. *Confeſſ. Bohem.*

And the Reformed French Church confeſs, that in the Lords Supper, not only all the Benefits of Chriſt, but his very Fleſh and Blood are there exhibited to us ; in the French Confeſſion you may find theſe Words, " For altho " he *Pag.* 37. *Confeſſ. Gall.*

" he be now in Heaven, and ſhall remain there till he come to judge " the World; yet we believe that by the ſecret and incomprehenſible " Vertue of his Spirit, he doth nouriſh and quicken us with the Subſtance " of his Body and Blood being apprehended by Faith. But we ſay " that this is done Spiritually, *&c.* Not a word of Tranſubſtantiation here.

Pag. 37. Then he proceeds to *Calvin*, and would make the World believe that he likewiſe owned it. Whereas it's plain that he mean'd nothing elſe but a Spiritual Preſence and a Spiritual Nouriſhment to the worthy Receivers. But becauſe our Author thinks he has got an Argument *ad hominem* againſt *Calviniſts*, I ſhall only ſet down a little from ſome of the follow Paragraphs, and then let any one judge how the Words he cites, can be Interpreted in his ſenſe.

Calv. Inſtit. L. 4. *C.* 17. *Sect.* 12. " And firſt, truly we muſt not dream of ſuch a preſence of Chriſt in " the Sacrament, as the Sophiſters of the Court of *Rome* have invented; " as if the Body of Chriſt locally preſent, were touched with our Hands, " broken with our Teeth, and ſwallowed with our Mouth. For Pope " *Nicholas* caus'd *Berengarius* to make this Form of Recantation. And

Sect. 14. " *Sect.* 14. Hence ſprung that *Tranſubſtantiation*, for which the *Romaniſts* " contend more eagerly at this day, than for all other the Articles of " their Faith——— But it is a wonder that Men deviate into ſuch Stupi- " ty and Ignorance, as to bring forth ſuch a Monſter of Opinion, not " only contrary to the expreſs meaning of the Scripture, but the univer- " ſal Conſent of the Ancient Church. Many more might be ſet down, but by theſe the Reader may ſee what a Champion *Calvin* has been for *Tranſubſtantiation*. And by this the Reader may judge what weight is to be laid as to the pretended acknowledgments of other Proteſtants in this point. But to take notice of all his Raileries againſt ſeveral Proteſtant Writers, would be too much labour, eſpecially ſeeing any Intelligent Reader may eaſily diſcover them. Our Author afterwards falls foul of *Beza*, but Railery being his Talent, we muſt give him his way.

From all theſe Premiſes, he ſays, *That no one thing in the World is more unfit to be ſet up for a Teſt, than Tranſubſtantiation.* I wonder what he means? Has he found out any Churches acknowledging *Tranſubſtantiation* as it is held by the Church of *Rome*? He has a ſtrange way of arguing; but his Argument ſhould run thus, Becauſe all Proteſtants acknowledge a kind of preſence of a Spiritual Nature, and which they profeſs themſelves that they do not determine what it is: Therefore it is a moſt unreaſonable thing to impoſe *Tranſubſtantiation* a thing plainly determined by the Church of *Rome*, as Matter of Abjuration, and then his Argument would loſe all its ſtrength. Nor does any thing in the *Teſt* contradict the Opinion of any Proteſtants, ſo as it ſhould be ſtyled by our Author, *A Defiance to Chriſtendom.* For it only ſwears againſt that Real Preſence which is maintained by the Church of *Rome*, and conſiſts in the Conver-

Converſion or Tranſubſtantiation into the Body and Blood of Chriſt after the Prieſts muttering the words, *This is my Body.*

The Church of England, he ſays, *agrees with the Tradition of the Catholick Church both Roman and Reformed in Aſſerting the certainty of the Real Preſence.* A mighty Reconciler o' my word! We always thought that there was a vaſt difference between us; but it ſeems our Author has had the happineſs to end differences above any that have ever been before him. Pag. 46.

But he comes in with his Exceptions, *tho the true account of it hath been miſerably perplexed and diſturbed by the Oblique Practiſes of the Sacramentarians.* Bene aſſeris Domine, male probas. Ib. d.

And to make good his accuſation, he Libels Dr. *St.* as guilty of foiſting in ſome Inviſible Manuſcript for his Opinion; for his words ſeem to import ſo much. But *Quære*, Why the Learned Author held his Peace ſo long, when a Truth of ſuch Conſequence has ſuffer'd ſo much by his ſilence? He will give us a ſhrew'd Reaſon to ſuſpect that he aims more at Preferment than diſcovery of Truth, elſe he would have mentioned theſe things before now. But how could theſe things be if the Real Preſence were the general Opinion, not only of our Church, but of all the Proteſtant Churches? He goes on as much as he can to beſpatter the Church whereof he pretends to be a Member, as ſuffering ſo many Innovations to be brought into her. And yet who thoſe Innovators were he cannot tell; for ſays he (*whoever they were.*) A very probable buſineſs that Innovations ſhould be brought in contrary to the general ſenſe of a Church, and yet no body ſhould know by whom. One would almoſt think by his arguing, that he had learned a little of the Mahumetan Sophiſtry. But let us hear what Innovations were brought in. *It was made*, ſays he, *in the 5th Year of the Kings Reign, tho preciſely when and by what Perſons is not known.* It may be our Author has this from ſome Inviſible Manuſcript. For it is more like, that ſuch a Tale in a Tub as this is ſhould be of ſuch Original, than that of Dr. *St.* It is no wonder if we cannot give a particular Account of what Corruptions were brought into the Church at a far greater diſtance of time, if our Author is to ſeek to make thoſe appear that were ſo lately brought in. Pag. 47.

One thing is very much worth the Obſerving *that* Calvins *Correſpondency with the Protector gave a fatal blow to the Reformation.* It is ſtrange if *Calvin* btought in this Innovation as to the Real Preſence, when our Author pretends to bring him in above ſo much for it. I will not ſay he contradicts himſelf, but leave it to the Reader to Judge. But he goes on, They appoint this *Zuinglian* Form, *Take and eat this* (without mention of Body and Blood) *in remembrance that Chriſt died for thee.* I wonder how our Author can carp at this when it is almoſt the very words of our Saviour, *Do this in Remembrance of me.* And he goes on further that they were not ſatisfied with the alteration of the Old Form, but added a fierce Declaration to bar the Doctrine of Real and Eſſential Preſence, which ſee in the Rubrick after the Communion, and our Author ſets it down at large. Our Author is of a very moderate Temper, who rather than want an Argument that Noblemen ſhould not be impoſed upon to ſwear to Intricacies and Falſhoods, will render the Church he pretends to be a Member of Infamous; for ſo ſhe muſt be if what he ſays be true, that ſhe ſuffered ſuch Innovations to be brought in contrary to her own and the ſenſe of all Reformed Churches. But what proof for all this? Nay for that he thinks himſelf of ſuch unqueſtionable Authority that if he once ſay it, no Man ſhould doubt of it. However I find he is very good at the old way of Traducing, *Fortiter calumniare aliquid adhærebit.* Pag. 51. Pag. 52.

One would almoſt think this a bold practice in a bold Writer thus to impoſe things which look ſo like Forgeries upon the World. Nay one could ſcarce think it lookt like ſenſe to call that an Innovation, which according to his own Conceſſion was brought in but in the 5th Year of K. *Edward* the VI. Reign, and conſequently of the Reformation; unleſs our Author would likewiſe ſay that the whole Proteſtant Doctrine was an Innovation. Eſpecially ſeeing neither could they whoſe Office it was to Reform ſee through all things at firſt view; nor poſſibly, would they bring in all things requiſite for a through Reformation at firſt, but firſt inform the Peoples Underſtandings as to the ſeveral groſs Errors of the Church of *Rome*, that ſo they might remove the unjuſt Prejudices they might have had againſt them, which might have occaſioned great Diſturbance had they been at firſt Enacted.

pag. 53. Dr. *Burnet*, ſays he, *has often heard it ſaid, that the Articles were fram'd by* Cranmer *and* Ridley; *but whoever told him ſo, knew no more than himſelf*: and whoever tells him that it's not ſo, knows as little; and one would think, that he who contradicts an Hiſtorian, ſhould bring at leaſt as ſtrong Reaſons for it, as he whom he contradicts: And yet all that our Author brings to make his Charge good, is a Conjecture: For he ſays in the very next Paragraph; *All that can be conjectured, is*, &c.

pag. 58. He ſays, "That in the beginning of Queen *Elizabeth*'s Reign, when the Re-"formation was ſetled in that ſtate in which it ever after continued; and that "new Declaration of the ſecond Liturgy of King *Edward*, &c. was rejected, "and the firſt old Form of Diſtribution was reſtored, *&c.* But if ſo, how comes it that our Author has produced no Inſtances of it from thoſe who were then living? And how comes it that that Declaration is ſtill extant in the Rubrick, that they acknowledge no Preſence, ſave only after a Spiritual manner?

pag. 58, 59, *&c.* He pretends that the moſt famous Divines of our Church, were ſtiff Avouchers of his Real Preſence, and Inſtanceth in Biſhop *Andrews*. But what he inſtanceth out of him, makes very little for his purpoſe, as appears by theſe words in his Citation: *Only we define nothing raſhly of its* modus, *neither do we curiouſly enquire into it, no more than how the Blood of Chriſt cleanſeth us in our Baptiſm.* Now ſeeing the Learned Biſhop ſays that he will not curiouſly enquire into it no more than how the Blood of Chriſt cleanſeth us in Baptiſm, and that is by all underſtood in a Spiritual ſenſe (for no Church affirms that the Blood of Chriſt muſt enter into our Bodies for the cleanſing us) it muſt needs follow, that he likewiſe underſtood the Preſence of Chriſt in a Spiritual ſenſe, and conſequently had no reſpect to a Corporal Preſence. And whereas he alledges Biſhop *Poinet* is of the ſame opinion, our Author would have done well, if he had read over that Citation of him in the Biſhop of *Durham*'s Hiſtory of *Tranſubſtantiation*, and he would have found theſe words at the cloſe of it: *Laſtly, he affirms, according to the unanimous conſent of the Fathers, That this Matter muſt be underſtood in a Spiritual ſenſe, baniſhing all groſſer and more carnal thoughts.* And what theſe words import, let any man judge.

Hiſt. Tranſubſtantiation, p. 10.

Art. 8. *p.* 283. *Art.* 14. *p.* 368. & 382.

But becauſe our Author is ſo much for Inſtances, I ſhall likewiſe ſet down a few. The firſt is that of the Famous Biſhop *Jewel*, in his Anſwer to *Harding*; who proves, *That to give the honour of God to a Creature, is manifeſt Idolatry, as the Papiſts do in the Adoration of the Hoſt*, &c. Which he would never have attempted, had he been for the Corporal Preſence.

Diſp. of Chriſtian Subjection, pt. 4. *p.* 319. The next is that of Biſhop *Bilſon*, who proves the Church of *Rome* guilty of Idolatry; 1. *In the worſhip of Images, the having of which was never Catholick*;

and the Worshipping of them was ever wicked by the judgment of Christs Church, &c. 2. *In the Adoration of the Host*; of which he Treats at large.

A third is of Bishop *Taylor*, in these words: "Now by this Spiritual Presence "of Christ, we understand Christ to be present, as the Spirit of God is present "in the Hearts of the Faithful, by Blessing and Grace; and this is all that we "mean, besides the Tropical and Figurative presence. And p. 14. We say "Christs Body is in the Sacrament Really, but Spiritually; our meaning is, "that it is present to our Spirits only; that is, so as Christ is not present to any "other sense, but that of Faith, or spiritual susception. And p. 13. In the Sacra- "ment is given us the true substance of Christs Body or Flesh, but not Carnally, "but Spiritually; that is, not to our *Mouths*, but to our *Hearts*; not to be chew- "ed by *Teeth*, but to be eaten by *Faith*. And p. 7. The Doctrine of the Church "of *England*, and generally of the *Protestants* in this Article, is this, That after "the Minister of the Holy Mysteries hath rightly prayed, and Consecrated the "Bread and Wine, the Symbols become changed into the Body and Blood of "Christ, after the Sacramental, that is, in a Spiritual Real manner; so that all "that worthily Communicate, do by Faith receive Christ really, effectually to "all the purposes of his Passion, the Wicked receiving not Christ, but the bare "Symbols only. *Real Presence*, p. 15.

Our Author *after all*, thinks he has made his Adversaries quit the Field, and *leaves it to the Ingenuity of Mankind, to judge whether any thing can be more barbarous, than to make the Renouncing a Mystery so universally received, a State TEST.* (Not so barbarous neither, as to punish Dissenters with *Pillories, Whipping-Posts, Rods, Axes, Scourges, &c.*) And yet when he done his utmost, there is not one of all the above-cited, either Persons or Communities, save our dear Brethren of the Church of *Rome*, that approves of *Transubstantiation*, or the Conversion of the Bread and Wine into the very Body and Blood of *Christ*; which is the Particular swore against in the *Test*. pag. 62.

He charges the Sacramentarians with profane Boldness, for insisting on the Natural *Impossibility* of the Thing it self to the Divine Omnipotence, and so of prescribing Measures to the Divine Attributes: But he might as well say one were profanely bold, that should affirm, That it were not possible even to Divine Omnipotence, that the Author *Of the Reasons for Abrogating the Test*, should at the same minute of time both Write in favour of the *Papists*, and not write in favour of the *Papists*, i. e. that it is impossible that our Author can at the same Individual Minute of time write for them and not write for them. For the other has been proved as manifest a contradiction as this is. pag. 64.

We shall not trouble the Reader with further tracing our Author as to this Point, it being a hard matter to find him any where. But shall briefly give an account of the rise of Transubstantiation, and then shew its Repugnancy to Scripture and Reason.

About the Year of our Lord 900, horrible darkness overspread the Church of Christ: Nothing of soundness either in Doctrine or Manners, the Popes, Bishops, Priests were Rude, Flagitious, Wicked, whence, that Age by Writers was called *Unhappy, Sad* and *Miserable*. In so great Darkness what wonder is it if the grossest Errours prevailed? Then began that Opinion of *Oral Eating* of the Body of Christ in the Holy Supper. For *Paschasius Ratbertus* Abbot of *Corbia*, and *Amalarius* Bishop of *Treves*, introduce a kind of Substantial Conversion & Presence. *Rabanus Maurus* Archbishop of *Montz* and *John Erigena* a Scot, a very Learned Man, who acknowledged only a Figurative Sense of the Words, which latter while he opposed that gross Manducation, was Stabb'd by his Scholars with a Pen-knife at the Instinct of the Monks.

After that *Berengarius* Archdeacon of *Andegavia*, being very well seen in *Augustines* Writings vindicated the true Doctrine about the Holy Supper to [illegible]

in the Bread and Wine not Subſtantially, *but* Sacramentally, and ſo rejected the *Carnal Preſence* and *Oral Manducation*, tho he uttered it in harſh and undigeſted expreſſions; *Lanfranc* vigorouſly oppoſed him, but chiefly upon this ground, *That he was a Heretick, becauſe he diſſented from the* Church *of* Rome. *Berengarius* was condemn'd in a Synod at *Vercelles* under *Leo* IX. and at laſt under *Nicholas* II. in the *Lateran* Council in the Year 1059. through human Infirmity he revoked his Opinion, but being touch't with remorſe, he wrote againſt that Revocation. Notwithſtanding that Hereſie took root in the Church.

Berengarius being dead, the True and Ancient Doctrine he maintained, did not die with him. For it was ſtill conſtantly maintained by St. *Bernard*, Abbot of *Clairvaux*, who lived about the beginning of the 12. Century. In his Diſcourſe on the Lords Supper, he joyns together *the outward Form of the Sacrament, and the Spiritual Efficacy of it.* And in his Sermon on the *Purification*, which none doubts to be his, he ſays, *The Body of Chriſt in the Sacrament, is the Food of the Soul, not of the Belly; therefore we eat him not Corporally, but in the manner that Chriſt is Meat, in the ſame manner we underſtand that he is eaten.* And in his Sermon on St. *Martin*; *To this day*, ſaith he, *the ſame Fleſh is given us, but Spiritually, therefore not Corporally.*

St. Bern. A. 1120. *Serm. de cœna Domini Joh.* 6. 56--63. *Serm. de Purif. B. Mariæ. Serm. de S. Maart. In Exod. l.* 2. *c.* 10.

About the ſame time *Rupertus*, Abbot of *Tuitium*, taught alſo the Bread in the *Euchariſt* is not converted: His words are theſe; *You muſt not attribute all to the Operation of the Holy Ghoſt, who never ſpoils or deſtroys any Subſtance he uſeth, but to that natural Goodneſs it had before, adds an inviſible Excellency which it had not.*

Otho, Biſhop of *Friſingen*, a Man every way Famous, lived in the ſame Age; and he alſo believed, and writ, *That the Bread and Wine remain in the Euchariſt.*

Chriſt Agrican Antipiſt. p. 13.

As for the word *Tranſubſtantiation*, it's hardly to be found before the middle of this Century: For the firſt that mention it, are ([a]) *Petrus Bleſenſis*, who lived under Pope *Alexander* the 3d. and ([b]) *Stephen Eduenſis*, whoſe Age and Writings are very doubtful.

([a]) *Ep.* 140 ([b]) *de Sacr. Altaris in B. patrum.*

In the 13. Century the Biſhop of *Rome* began to exalt himſelf, not only over the Univerſal Church, but even over all the Empires and Kingdoms of the World. New Orders of Friars ſprung up in this Age, who diſputed fiercely againſt many Doctrines of the Antient and Purer Church, and amongſt the reſt, againſt that of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Chriſt. So that now there remained nothing but to Confirm this new Tenet, and impoſe it ſo peremptorily in the Chriſtian World, that none durſt hiſs againſt it. This Pope *Innocent* the Third bravely performed. Who ſucceeding *Celeſtine* the 3d. at 30. years of age, and following briskly the footſteps of *Hildebrand*, called a Council at *Rome* in St. *John Lateran*, & was the firſt that ever made the New-deviſed Doctrine of *Tranſubſtantiation*, an Article of Faith neceſſary to Salvation.

In Hiſt. Joan Regis Angliæ. Mat. Par. in Hiſt. Min. in Platin. in Vit. Innoc. 3.

This is that *Innocent*, who to enlarge his Authority, wrought great Troubles to the Emperor *Philip*; ſtript *Otho* the 4th. of the Empire; forced *John*, King of *England*, to yield up into his hand this Kingdom, and that of *Ireland*, and made them Tributary to the See of *Rome*. *He was proud and ambitious* (ſays *Mat. Paris*) *and ever ready to commit the moſt wicked Villanies, ſo he might be recompenſed for it.* This was the Man, who in his *Lateran Council* pronounced that *Tranſubſtantiation* ſhould be made an Article of Faith; and when the Council would not grant is, did himſelf by his own Arbitrary Power, againſt which none durſt open his Mouth. For thoſe Canons which at this day go under the name of the Council, are none of his, but meerly the Decrees of Pope *Innocent*, firſt writ by him, & read in the Council, and diſliked by many, and afterward ſet down in the Book of Decretals under certain Titles, by his Nephew *Gregory* the 9th.

Mat. Par. in Hiſt. ad An. 1215.

Having thus given a breif account of the riſe of this groſs Hereſie, I ſhall now endeavour to ſhew the groſs Abſurdity of it by the following Arguments.

1. This Opinion makes *Chriſt* guilty of groſs Nonſenſe in his Inſtitution of the Holy Supper. For his words are; *Take, eat; this is my Body; do this in Remembrance of me.* Now if that Bread had been *Chriſts* real Body after Conſecration, his ſaying, *Do this in remembrance of me*, muſt have been Egregious Nonſenſe. For we neither do nor can remember things preſent, the act of Memory or Remembrance being ſuch as always reſpects a Thing abſent or paſt.

2. This Opinion infers, that God deludes his Creatures, which ſo much as to think of him is moſt horrible Blaſphemy. But if it were true, that after Conſecration the Wafer and Wine were become the Body and Blood of *Chriſt*, then muſt it be of neceſſity ſaid, that God deluded his Creatures, for he repreſents it to all the Senſes, under the ſame appearance as before Conſecration, and yet as they ſay, it is quite another thing; to wit, the Body and Blood of *Chriſt*. And can there be greater Juggling in the World than this would be? And ſuppoſe this to be a Damnable Miſtake, ſhould not he poſitively be the cauſe of their Sin, and conſequently damn them for that which they had all the reaſon in the world to adhere to, ſeeing that they were to adhere to the teſtimony of their Senſes, in ſo far as they were capable of perceiving Material Objects by them. And the Body of Chriſt being ſuch, cannot be reckoned among thoſe Myſteries the Apoſtle ſpeaks of, which Eye hath not ſeen,

nor

nor heart perceive, &c. For those things the Apostle speaks of, are things of an immaterial and spiritual Nature, which cannot by themselves make any impression on the Senses, and besides, otherwise transcend the thoughts of Men, such as the Mystery of the *Trinity*: But that cannot be said of the *Body of* Christ, seeing Eyes have seen it, and as a Body, it could enter into the Heart of Man to conceive of it, as being finite.

3. A Sacrament or Sign, is different from that thing whose Sign and Sacrament it is. Now, they must all acknowledge, that the *Bread* and *Wine*, even after *Consecration*, (for before it cannot be called a Sacrament) is a Sacrament or Sign of the *Body* and *Blood* of *Christ*; therefore, even after Consecration, it is different from the *Body* and *Blood* of *Christ*. The Proposition is clear, for it is a notorious contradiction, to say the thing signifying, and the thing signified, are one and the same thing, and as much as to say, the thing signified, is not the thing signified, &c. which to any will appear.

4. If in Baptism, after Consecration, the Water is not turned into the *Blood* of *Christ*, then in the *Lords Supper*, the *Bread* and *Wine*, after Consecration, is not turned into the *Body* and *Blood* of *Christ*: But that in *Baptism*, the Water is not changed into the *Blood* of *Christ*, all are agreed, Therefore not in the *Lords Supper*. The Consequence is clear, For *Baptism* is the Initiating Sacrament, and begets as it were a new Creation in the Soul, or Regeneration, as our Saviour terms it, whereas by the *Lords Supper*, that Image that is Created is kept up; which is no greater work at least than the first creating of it. And if so be that that first change is begot in the Soul, without *Transubstantiating* the Water into the *Blood* of *Christ*, by the Power of God unknown to us, why should we assert that in order to the *Lords Supper*'s operating its blessed Effect upon the Soul, the *Bread* and *Wine* therein made use of, must be *Transubstantiated* into the *Body* and *Blood* of our *Lord*. For the Parity holds.

I shall add some Instances out of the Fathers, to shew that that Doctrine of the *Real Presence* (as the *Romanists* hold it) was not heard of in their days.

Theodoret says, *Jesus Christ hath Honoured the Visible Symbols with the Name of his* Body and Blood, *not in changing their Nature, but in adding the Grace.* Dial. 2.

The Bread of the Sacrament, saith *Chrysostome*, *is called Bread before it is Sanctified, but Divine Grace having Sanctified it by the Ministry of the Priest, it is no longer called* Bread, *but it is judged Worthy to be called the* Body of Christ.

Pope *Gelasius*, at the end of the Ninth *Century*: *Certainly*, saith he, *the Sacraments of the* Body and Blood *of* Christ, *which you receive, are something that is Divine; whence also it is, That by them we are made Partakers of the Divine Nature; and nevertheless they still retain the Nature and Substance of* Bread *and* Wine. Gelas. de duabus in Christo natur. ad Nestor. & Euseb.

A Council of the *East*, Assembled at *Constantinople*, *Anno* 754. declares, *That* Jesus Christ *Commanded us to offer the Image of his Body, a Thing chosen, to wit, the Substance of the* Bread. Concil. Const. in AB. Nicen. 2. AB. 6.

Innumerable more might have been produced, to prove that it was the constant received Opinion, even till the *Ninth Century*; For the first that ever Wrote against it, was, that *Paschasius Ratbertus*, made mention of above.

This gross Opinion had its Original from a gross and carnal Understanding of *Christ*'s Words, *John* the 6. And if any consider the occasion of that Discourse, they will find no such Doctrine designed by *Christ*; For it was occasioned from the *Jews* following *Christ*, because they had been filled by a *Miracle*. *Christ* tells them, *They must Labour for the true Food of the Soul*, to wit, Himself; and thence makes a comparison between *Bread*, which is the Food of the Body, ad *Himself*, who is the

riſheth, but that of the Soul endureth for ever; after the ſame manner that he ſpake of the *Living Water*, to the Woman of *Samaria*, *John* 4. And when the Multitude ſuppoſing him to mean by theſe Words, *Except ye Eat the Fleſh, and Drink the Blood of the Son of Man, ye ſhall not have Life in you*; that they muſt Carnally and Orally Eat his very *Body*, which was then ſpeaking to them; they lookt upon his Doctrine as Salvageneſs it ſelf; and from that Time many went away from him: And while his Diſciples themſelves Murmured at it, he ſaith unto them, *Does this offend you?* Ver. 62. *What if you ſee the Son of Man go up where he was at firſt?* 63. *It is the Spirit that quickeneth, the Fleſh profiteth nothing; The Words that I ſpeak, they are Spirit and Life:* From which, it is plain, That he deſigned nothing leſs than this Oral Manducation; For the eating of Man's Fleſh hath been a thing all Nations accounted abominable.

Joh. 6. 53.

De Nat. Deor. 3. And hence, ſays *Cicero*, *When we call Wine*, Bacchus, *and our Fruits*, Ceres, *we uſe the common manner of ſpeaking; but do you think any of us to be ſo Mad, as to account that which he Eats to be his* God?

Apud Perron. de Euch. l. 3. c. 29. p. 973. And *Averrhoes*, a Famous Heathen Philoſopher, who lived about the *Eleventh Century*, when this Monſtrous Doctrine of *Oral Manducation* had a little obtain'd in the *Chriſtian* Church, expreſſed himſelf thus againſt it: *I have enquired into all Religions, and have found none more fooliſh than the* Chriſtians, *becauſe that very* God *they Worſhip, they with their Teeth devour:* And concludes thus, *Becauſe the* Chriſtians *Eat what they do Worſhip, let my Soul go to the* Philoſophers. Hence the *Mahometans*, as the higheſt Calumny they can caſt upon us, reproach us, *As Devourers of our God.* Nay, they affirm, That by thus eating of his *Fleſh*, the *Chriſtians* uſe him worſe than the *Jews* did, who Crucified Him; *Becauſe*, ſay they, *it is more Salvage to Eat his Fleſh, and Drink his Blood, than only to procure his Death.*

It is obſervable, That from ſome Hereticks of the *Firſt Century*, the *Capernaiſts*, &c. groſs Interpretation of the 6 *Chapter* of St. *John's* Goſpel, ſprung that abominable Cuſtom, of initiating them with a draught of an Infants Blood, and eating the Fleſh of it; which Barbarous Cuſtom is ſuppoſed to owe its Original to *Simon Magus*. And the *Heathens* of thoſe days, charged the Practiſe of thoſe Monſtrous Hereticks on the True Church of *Chriſt*: Of which *Salvianus* ſaith thus, *They ſuppoſed that we were initiated into our Religion by two abominable Villanies, by* Inceſt *and* Murther: Inceſt *of the Holy* Matrons, *and* Murther *of* Infants; *who, they believe, were not only Butchered, but likewiſe Devoured by us.*

Lib. 4. de Providentia.

We next proceed to our *Authors* ſecond Head, to wit, of *Idolatry*, where we ſhall firſt conſider it as to Image Worſhip, and ſecondly, as to Invocation of Saints, &c.

Pag. 69, 70. Our *Author*, firſt holds out what a damnable Sin this is; and truly, in that we agree with him. And therefore he takes it very Hainouſly; *Such an Indictment ſhould be preferred againſt the greateſt part of* Chriſtendom; and truly if there were not ſtrong Preſumption at leaſt for it, they were very much to blame of breach of Charity that attempted it.

But in this Caſe, we may juſtly ſay to the Author, *Medice cura teipſum*; for no Man could preſer a Bloodier *Indictment* againſt that beſt part of *Chriſtendom* than he, while he ſaid, *We Condemn neither* Turk *nor* Papiſt, *on any other ground than this, that the one gives Worſhip to a Lewd* Impoſtor, *the other, to a ſenceleſs piece of* Matter.

71. He deſires, *Men would lay aſide their Indecent Heats, and Soberly enquire into the Nature, and Original of* Idolatry: And concludes his Paragraph, with, *Wiſhing to God there be nothing worſe at the bottom of it, ſeeing it has always been ſet up as the Standard againſt* Monarchy. I thought always that to be a more dangerous Standard ſet up againſt *Monarchy*, of the *Popes* takeing upon them to Excommunicate

Kings: Inferiour *Prieſts* and *Friers*, ſuch as, *Ravillac* and *Clement*, Murdering them (and yet the ſame Aſſaſſinates juſtified in their Barbarous Murder, by the *Popes* themſelves, or they are baſely Belyed) than any Notion of *Idolatry*. But, that our *Author* may remember, That, Men as *Loyal* as himſelf, and as far from being *Fanatical* or *Unlearned*, have entertained different Notions of *Idolatry*, from this I ſhall Inſert the following Paſſages.

Biſhop *Whitgift* ſaith, *I do as much miſlike the diſtinction of the* Papiſt, *and the intent of it, as any Man doth, neither do I go about to excuſe them from Wickedneſs, and* (*without Repentance and* God's *ſingular Mercy*,) *damnable* Idolatry. *There are three kinds of* Idolatry; *one is, when the true* God *is Worſhiped by other means and ways than he hath preſcribed, or would be Worſhiped. The other, is when the True* God *is Worſhiped with Falſe* God's. *The* third, *is when we Worſhip Falſe* God's, *either in Heart, Mind, or in external Creatures, Living or Dead; and altogether forget the Worſhip of the True* God. *All theſe three kinds are deteſtable, but the* firſt *is the leaſt, and the* laſt *the worſt. The* Papiſts *Worſhip* God, *otherwiſe than his Will is, and otherwiſe than he hath Preſcribed, almoſt in all points of their Worſhip; they alſo give to the Creature, that which is due to the Creator, and Sin againſt the firſt Table; yet are they not, for all that I can ſee or learn, in the third kind of* Idolatry. *Defence to the Anſwer of the Admon. Tr. 8. p. 152.*

Biſhop *Abbot*, in his Anſwer to *Biſhop*, affirmeth, *That the Church of* Rome, *by the* Worſhip of Images, *hath matched all the* Idolatries *of the* Heathens, *and brought all their Jugling devices into the Church; abuſing the Ignorance and Simplicity of the People, as* Groſly *and* Damnably, *as ever they did.* *Tom. 2. Pag. 1106.*

Arch Biſhop *Laud*, in his Conference, ſaith, *The Antient Church knew not the Adoration of* Images; *and the Modern Church of* Rome *is too like to* Paganiſm, *in the practice of it, and driven to Scarce Intelligible Subtilities in her Servants Writings, that defend it, and this without any Care had of Millions of Souls, unable to underſtand her Subtilities, or ſhun her* Practiſe. *Pag. 277.*

I hope our *Author*, will not call theſe Learned Writers *Fanatical*, *Unlearned*, or *Uncharitable*, &c. And yet they here prefer a Bloody Indictment againſt the greateſt part of *Chriſtendom*.

To paſs by his Notions, at the firſt Corruption of the World, by *Idolatry*, He ſays, *As ſoon as the* Iſraelites *ſat down at the Foot of Mount* Sinah, God's *care was to make further proviſion againſt* Idolatry, *where he gives the* Ten Commandments; *whereof the firſt four, are directly levelled againſt* Idolatry. *Let us ſee how he makes good his Argument.* *Pag. 77.*

Firſt, ſays he, *He enjoyns the Worſhip of himſelf, who, by his Almighty Power, has delivered them from their* Egyptian *Bondage.* *Ibid.*

Obſerve, how Candidly our *Author* Comments upon the Firſt *Commandment*, ſetting down only the Poſitive part thereof, whereas it has alſo a Negative Senſe, as appears from the very Words. *Thou ſhalt have no other* God's *before Me.* And this is a very cunning Artifice of his; the moſt probable way to explain it, ſo as to vindicate them from the charge of *Idolatry*: For if this *Command* run only *Poſitive*, and the ſecond *Negative*, then he would have a very great advantage: The *firſt* would run ſo, *Thou ſhalt pay me that Worſhip that is due to me*: And the *ſecond*, thus, *Thou ſhalt not pay that Worſhip which is due to me, to any* Graven Image.

Had the *Romaniſts* thought of this way of maintaining the firſt and ſecond *Commands* to be different, ſo as to be yet free from any charge of *Idolatry*, in their Worſhipping of *Images*, they might have freed themſelves of that ſuſpicious Guilt, incurred by expunging the Second: For it argues a Guilt in them, in ſo far at leaſt, that they fear the Common People would take that to be the plain and obvious Meaning

of it; which we maintain, and consequently might suspect them of Jugling in this point. And, I humbly think, our *Author*, seeing he is so much in their Vindication, that he might have said somewhat in their Justification, as to that Cancelling of the Second *Commandment*; especially when there lies so heavy a Curse upon those, who either add to, or diminish from the Law of *God*.

But that his Notion will not hold Good, appears by the Words themselves, *Thou shalt have no other* God's *before me*: That is, I am the only True *God*, who Created the World, and all things therein; preserve them by my Omnipotent Arm, and besides those common Providences, have manifested a particular Care over you, in bringing you out of the Land of *Egypt*, and expect that you especially Worship and Adore me, and none but me: And so, here the Lord sheweth them the True Object of Worship; to wit, that it is neither *Sun*, *Moon*, nor *Stars*, &c. but himself alone; and consequently prohibits in this *Commandment*, the Adoration of *Sun*, *Moon*, and *Stars*, and all other false *God*'s.

Our *Author* is no less Ingenuous in his Explication of the Second *Command*, for he leaves out the most material Word in it, *Make*, which very Word will Mar his True, and only Notion of *Idolatry*; to wit, Worship of the *Sun*, &c. For, certainly *God* would not forbid them to make the *Sun*, for that was above their Power. Nor, *Secondly*, can he be said here meerly to forbid making an *Image* of the *Sun*, as a Symbol of it; for the Worship of the *Sun* it self, being forbid in the *First Command*, as also all other false Deities; none could be so Brutish, as to imagine that *God* would take up a New *Commandment*, in forbidding to make or Worship the Image of those false Deities. It remains therefore, That the Second *Commandment* must run thus, *Thou shalt not make any Representation or likeness of Me, nor shalt Worship me, by any likeness or Representation of me, by any thing that is in Heaven, on Earth, or in the* Waters *under the* Earth; which was as plain as could have been said, *Ye shall make, nor bow down to no Representation or likeness whatsoever.*

Deut. 4. 5. And, That this is the scope of this *Commandment*, may further appear, from *Deut.* 4. 15, 16, 17, 18, 19. where the Lord himself explains that *Command*, ver. 15. *Take ye therefore good heed unto your selves*: [As if he had said, I know you are strangely byast from the True way of Adoring me, which I have appointed; and are very prone to set up a way after your own Invention, to wit, by making a visible Representation of me, which is highly derogatory to my Glory; and therefore I warn you, over and over again, take heed to your selves] (*for you saw no manner of similitude, on the day that the Lord spake unto you out of* Horeb, *out of the midst of the Fire.*) q. d. Had I design'd that you should make any External Likeness or Similitude, or Representation of Me, I would have appeared to you in some Similitude, and appointed you to Worship me under that Similitude; but I did it not, and I do hereby shew you, That I did not appear to you in any Similitude, that you might not presume to Worship me, under any Similitude, which is so odious to me. *Ver.* 16. *Lest you corrupt your selves, and make you a Graven* 16. Image, *the similitude of any Figure, the likeness of Male and Female,* 17. *The like-* 17. *ness of any* Beast *that is on the* Earth, *the likeness of any winged* Fowl, *that is on the* Earth; *the likeness of any thing that creepeth on the Ground*, &c. A sufficient enumeration of all the kinds of likenesses, and does necessarily import thus much, Thou shalt make no *Graven Image*, nor no likeness of any Thing, to make use of in those Acts of Adoration which are due to me, as I am Soveraign Creator of all 18. Things, and your *God* by a special Relation. Then, *Ver.* 18. he proceeds to caution them to beware of a more gross sort of *Idolatry*, which strikes immediately against the *First Commandment*: *And lest thou lift up thine Eyes unto Heaven*

Heaven, and when thou ſeeſt the Sun *and the* Moon, *and the* Stars, *even all the Hoſt of* Heaven, *thou ſhouldeſt be driven to Worſhip them, and Serve them, which the* Lord *thy* God *hath divided unto all* Nations *under the whole* Heaven. Nothing can be more plain, Than that there are two kinds of *Idolatry* forbidden here; to wit, *Leſt you corrupt your ſelves, and make a* Graven Image; *and leſt that thou ſeeſt the* Sun, *&c. thou* Worſhip *them, and* Serve *them*: And therefore, that of worſhipping the *Sun, Moon,* &c. is not the true and only Notion of *Idolatry:* And if we obſerve the Order of the two ſorts of *Idolatry*, mentioned above, they give us no ſmall hint how the one diſpoſſeſt People to receive the other, even on this account, as it is the Nature of all Sin, and particularly of this which *God* has declared to be ſo diſhonourable to him, to darken the Powers of the Soul, and weaken the *Conſcience*, which is that *Primum Mobile* in the Soul; and if pure, the whole Soul keeps right in its Motion; but if once defiled, the whole frame of the Soul turns into Confuſion, and becomes Captive to the Senſitive Part, and then who knows what horrid Abominations the Soul may be guilty of. And it is likewiſe very uſual with *God*, when People thus diſhonour him, not only to withdraw his Holy Spirit from them, ſo as actually to harden them, as he did *Pharoah*, when he would not let his People go. This is clearly pointed at in *Act.* 7. 41, 42. *And they made a Calf in thoſe Days, and Offered Sacrifice unto Idols, and rejoyced in the works of their own hands; then* God *turned and gave them up to worſhip the Hoſt of* Heaven. Moſt plainly pointing at two ſorts of *Idolatry*; and the one conſequent upon another, as a juſt Puniſhment inflicted on them by *God*, for their diſhonouring Him in making Symbols, and Repreſentations of Him. I am afraid our Author's true, and only Notion of *Idolatry*, will ſcarce endure the *Teſt*.

I now proceed to his Comment upon the *Third Command*; and thus you have him: *The* Engliſh *of the Third*, ſays he, *if it were rightly Tranſlated, runs thus*; Thou ſhalt not give the Name of the Lord thy *God* to a Vanity or Idol: A ſtrange Verſion of it. I deſire to know how by this Senſe, on this *Command*, the Reverend *Author* will prove thoſe Perſons Guilty of *Perjury*, who gave Birth and Original to the *Teſt*. For, allowing of this Interpretation, they cannot be guilty of any Treſpaſs againſt this Command; for they never gave the Name of God to a Vanity and Idols, at leaſt it will be a hard matter for the Author to prove they did. But to wave this, I am ſure the Debauches of the Nation, the Dammee's, that make it their conſtant Practice to tear the Sacred Name of God, muſt needs have a great Veneration for our Author; for they never had ſuch favourable Entertainment from any that ever we heard of before; for in their common Oaths they do not give the Name of God to an Idol, and ſo were only traduced before by Anticatholick, Unchriſtian, and Fanatical Notions of Blaſphemy, whereas they were guilty of no ſuch thing. Would our Author put but ſuch a Catholick and truly Chriſtian ſenſe upon three or four more of the Commandments, I cannot ſee but that Party were obliged to return Thanks to him from all parts of the Nation, for delivering them from thoſe Torments the Fanatical Notions of Men about that they call'd Sin hath created to them. But by our Author's leave, however he pretends the *Septuagint* renders it; yet 'tis plain that there was never a generally receiv'd ſenſe among the People of the *Jews*, as appears by their great Reverence to the Name of God, particularly that great Name by which he manifeſted himſelf, *viz. Jehovah*, which they pronounced but very ſeldom, and that upon very ſolemn occaſions.

And tho our Author determines the only deſign of God in the Fourth Command- *Pag.* 79.
ment, to be only to keep People from Idolatry; yet I doubt not, but God had other ends, to wit, the advancing of true Holineſs; for 'tis poſſible that a Church may be

free from any sort of our Authors Idolatry, and yet be abhorred by God, like that People of whom our Saviour spake, *That drew to him with their Lips, but their Hearts were far from him.* And that Church in *Laodicea*, in the *New Testament*, could not be charged with *Idolatry*, and yet was loathsome in Gods account.

Pag. 81. He instances the *Golden Calf* set up by the *Israelites* in *Moses* absence, and he concludes, that it was nothing else than an old *Egyptian* Idol: But I would seriously ask our Author, how it could be possible that the *Israelites* did Worship the *Calf* as the Symbol of some *Egyptian* Deity, as our Author alledges. For first, the occasion of it was, not on the least pretence of Infidelity as to the true God, but only because *Moses* had been so long absent from them, and they knew not what was become of him, and therefore they bid *Aaron* make them Gods that should go before them. Now, it cannot be supposed, that they could have been so strangely stupid, as to have Worshipped the *Egyptian* Gods of that time, if we consider what manifold wonders the True God wrought for them in the Land of *Egypt*, how heavily he lay his Hand upon the *Egyptians*, and yet in the mean while preserved them from those Plagues; they could not then be ignorant that the God whom they Worshipped, was of infinitely greater power than those the *Egyptians* worshipped. And they could not have so soon forgot that great Deliverance he wrought for them at the *Red Sea*, when the *Egyptians* were Drowned; they could not certainly but be then sensible that the God they served, was of infinitely greater Power than those the *Egyptians* worshipped. And but a little before, the Law was promulgated with Thunderings and Lightnings: Is it possible they could so soon have shaken off the dread of that God who had appeared so terrible to them? And further, even at this very time, when this Image was made, he Miraculously fed them with *Manna*, they could not but remember that they were never fed so in *Egypt*, and so they could not but acknowledge that that great God was infinitely to be preferred before the *Egyptian* Gods. But that very passage above cited of St. *Stephen*, *They made a Calf in those Days, and Offered to the works of their own Hands*, (certainly then not to the Sun, for that was not the work of their Hands) *then* God *turned, and gave them up to Worship the* Host of Heaven. Now, how could it be said, that he gave them up to Worship the *Host of Heaven*, if they were guilty of that *Idolatry* then, when they Worshipped the Calf. *Lastly*, There is no Imitation given in the whole Story, that they fell into the Heathen *Idolatry*; for afterwards, when they fell into it, the particular Names of the God's are mentioned, as, *Baal-Peor*, *Moloch*, *Remphan*.

But here on the contrary, *Aaron* expresly proclaims *A Feast to the Lord*, and the People accordingly met, and Offered there usual Offerings; whereas, had it been the *Egyptian Idolatry*, their common Sacrifices would have been Abominations; they must not have Sacrific'd Sheep and Oxen as they were wont to do, as our *Author* himself acknowledges.

Our *Author*, next mentions the Calves set up by *Jeroboam*, 1 *Kings*. 22. 20. 27. And he saith, *Its plain, that these Calves were set up by him, as Idols or Symbols of a new or Separate Religion from the Tribe of* Judah. It is plain *Jeroboam*'s design was not to pervert the People from the Worship of the *True God*, to that of the *Heathen Idols*, but only divert the People of *Israel* from going to *Jerusalem*; fearing least if the People should Yearly go up to *Jerusalem* to Worship, they should be again reduc'd to their Allegiance, to *Rehoboam*, and so cast off his Usurpation. Now, the occasion of the Kingdoms coming to him, was from *Solomons* falling to *Heathen Idolatry*, 1 *Kings*. 11. 33. Which would make him more cautious of falling into it, especially at his first entrance. In *Ahabs Idolatry*, the occasion and description of it

is

is given, 1 *Kings.* 11. 33. and the God he Worshipped particularly mentioned. But of *Jeroboam* it is only said, that he set up the Calves at *Dan* and *Beth*, and said unto the People, it is too much for you to go up to *Jerusalem*; *Behold thy* Gods, *O* Israel, *we have brought Thee up out of the Land of* Egypt, 1 *Kings.* 12.28. 29. How easie had it been for him to have said, that *Jeroboam* Worshipped the Gods of *Egypt*, had that been his intention! And *Jeroboam* would have argued much better, that they had hitherto been in a great mistake, concerning the *True God*, and not meerly as to the place of his Worship, which is all he speaks against; for he continued the same Feasts and way of Worship that were at *Jerusalem*.

But if this of *Jeroboam* is *Heathen Idolatry*, how comes the Sin of *Ahab* to be called so much greater than that of *Jeroboam*? How comes *Jehu* at the same time, to boast of his Zeal for the Lord, when it is said of him, that he departed not from the Sins of *Jeroboam*, *viz.* the *Golden Calves* of *Dan* and *Bethel*, 2 *Kings* 10. 16, 19. How comes the Prophet not to Reprove *Jeroboam*, for the Gods he Worshipped, but for the Altar; this was a very small Fault in respect of the former, had *Jeroboam* been guilty of *Heathen Idolatry*. And how comes the Worship of *God* to be preserved in the *Ten Tribes*, after their Captivity, when they still continued their Separation in Religion, from the Kingdom of *Judah*, 2 *Kings* 17. 28. For certainly, if the *Samaritans* had only desired Information concerning the Worship of the *God* of *Israel*, after the way of *Jerusalem*, they would have sent thither for it: But because they sent into the Land of the Captivity, for a *Priest* to be sent to them; it is plain, the former differences still continued.

From all which, it's plain, that *Jeroboam* did not fall into *Heathen Idolatry*; and yet we see he is charged therewith in Scripture, tho' not *Heathen Idolatry*, like that of *Ahabs*, for it is said, *That he had done Evil above all that were before him*; *and had gone and made him other* Gods, *and* Molten Images, *to provoke* God *to Anger, and had cast him behind his Back*: Which charge, may sufficiently Inform us how great a Sin this of Worshiping the True *God*, by *Images*, is. 1 *Kings* 14. 9.

The Second Head of Discourse, is, *That the* Gods *that they worshipped, at that time, were nothing but the Heavenly Bodies, or the* Sun, *as the Supream Deity.* Pag. 94.

But, how can it be supposed, that Men of Sense and Understanding should believe that to be a *God*, which is altogether void of it? And if the greatest Part of the World acknowledged such for *Gods* as had no Understanding, how could the Notion of the One Supream *God* be preserved among them?

Our *Author* goes about to Prove, That this was the Idolatry of the *Heathens*, by the Testimony of *Eusebius*: But he might have remembred, That this Passage is extant in his *Third Book*, *De Prepar. Evang.* that the Prophecy seemed to think that the *Egyptians* looked not beyond the *Sun*, *Moon*, and *Stars*; yet he acknowledges, that they represented the Creator with an *Egg* in his Mouth. Now, if they acknowledged a *God*, how can it be said, That they Worshipped the *Stars*, without any Notion of Demonstration. Pag. 96.

He brings in likewise *Diodorus Siculus*; but it seems he has not much Read him, or he would have been loath to have brought Him in, who makes so much against him; for in his First Book, after the Celestial *Gods*, he Treats of Men and Women Deified, of *Osiris*, *Isis*, and *Tryphon*; and says, That *Osiris* was equally Honoured with the Celestial *Gods*.

Eusebius in his Chronicles, saith, from the Testimony of *Berosus*, That tho' they Worshipped the *Sun*, under the Name of *Baal*, yet they believed a Supream *God*, whom they acknowledged to have produced all things. And by the Testimonies of *Plutarch* and *Zenophon*, the *Persians* owned a *God* above the *Sun*.

And

And *Macrobius* never affirm'd, That they had no Sense and Apprehension of a Supream *God*; but says in the beginning, that he speaks only of Sub-celestial *Gods*; and that the Antients believed that the *Sun* was Governour of the World. But where he speaks of the Supream *God*, he saith, That the Antients never made an Image of this *God*, because they thought him so far beyond our Conception. And so these several Authors, our Author quotes, do him very little Service in maintaining his True and Only Notion of *Idolatry*.

Pag. 125. Our Author says, It is no less Malice than Folly, to charge *Idolatry* upon all Christians of the *Roman* Communion. It consists, he says, of these Three Heads.

1. *The Worship of Images.*
2. *Adoration of the* Host.
3. *Invocation of Saints.*

And, whereas he justifies their making Images, from the Instance of the *Cherubims*: It is plain, there is a vast difference: For, as Idolatrous as the *Jews* were, they never paid any Worship to the *Cherubims*, as the *Papists* do, even by their own Concessions to *Images*. They never Invocated *Cherubims*, as the *Papists* do their *Crosses, Images, &c.* But in all their Acts of Worship, shewed that they paid no Worship thereto, by their continual use of this Expression: *Thou* God *that dwellest between the* Cherubims.

He saith, That if it follows that something more is required to make *Idolatry* than the use of *Images*, our Author has a particular Talent in the Art of *Sophistry*, through his whole Book, by foisting in Sentences of Ambiguous significations: For either, by use of them, may be meant a setting up of them in that Place; for Ornament, or by Vertue of a *Command*, without making any Application to them in Acts of Worship, as the *Jews* did in this Case; for it is more than certain, they would never have presumed to do such a thing, unless they had had a particular Command of *God*: Or it may be taken for an actual making use of them in Acts of Worship. In the former Sense, the *Jews* made use of the *Cherubims* in their Holy of Holies, but not in the latter; for it is plain, That they never directed any Act of Worship thereto; which, yet 'tis plain the *Papists* do. And if the *Jews* had done any such thing, *God* would have declared against it, and no doubt would rather cause them to be taken away, than had his Worship thereby polluted. A plain Instance of which we have in Scripture, in a thing no less of Divine Appointment than the Cherubims were; to wit, the *Golden Serpent*: For tho *God* appointed that to be kept, in remembrance of his curing them; and looking upon it, when they were stung by the Fiery Serpents, and likewise as a Type of our Saviour, as he himself declares to *Nicodemus*; yet when the People committed Idolatry therewith, the Good King destroyed it. By the way, I would ask our Author, whether they committed that Idolatry with it, which he says is the True and only Notion of Idolatry; to wit, if they Worshipt the *Sun* thereby? certainly he will not say that. And I hope he will not say, they Worshipt it self, so as to account it a *God*; for it is not probable, they could be so stupid in such a Good Kings Reign, especially when the Scripture does not say any such thing of them, with such a Sacred thing as that, even under the worst of their Kings, and those who were most prone to Idolatry. Nay, 'tis plain, That when they Worshipped strange Gods, they did not think there was any Divinity in the Image it self; and that hence they are called the *Gods* of the *Zidonians, Ammonites*, &c. Now, it is impossible that they could imagine that that Image, inclosed in their Temples, could be the Deity of that People whose Gods they Worshipt, but only that they set up an Image, to represent that GOD whom the *Ammonites*, &c. Worshipped. And it remains then, that they designed by it to Worship the LORD

and

and it may be paid such an honour to it as the [illegible] seeing that was reckoned *Idolatry* by God, our Author will please to Pardon us if we do not receive his true and only Notion of *Idolatry*.

3. Our Author may be answered by one of his own Authors (and such as maintains no *Anti*catholick Unchristian Principles) *Thomas Aquinas*. His words are: 'They were not set up to be Worshiped but 'for the sake of some Mystery: *viz.* the *Sanctum Sanctorum* Resembled 'Heaven; the *Ark* as the Foot-stool of God who was Incomprehensible, 'and therefore no resemblance of him was there; the Mercy-seat his 'Residence; the Cherubims represented the Company of Heavenly 'Angels waiting on him, whom they were forbidden to Worship, since 'that was due to God alone.

Our Author comes off with a fair sham, *If it be no Idolatry to Worship towards an* Image, *after all their Frights they fairly give up the Cause to the Church of* Rome. Where again observe his Æquivocation, Worship towards an *Image*. For it may be either taken barely for Worshiping towards a place where the *Image* is, and without any respect to it, no more than they knew not of any *Image's* being there; no man will call that *Idolatry*; but that will do the Church of *Rome* no Service; Or it may be taken for Worship towards the *Image* it self, so as the Person directs himself immediately to the *Image* and pays it some Adoration, and that this is *Idolatry* hath been already evinced from Scripture: Nor has our Author for all his bustling vindicated her from the Aspersion of it. p. 125.

I shall only Insert an Argument or two out of the Fathers of *Constantinople*, the first is against *Images* thus: 'That all the Representation of Christ allowed us by the Gospel, is that which Christ himself Instituted, in the Elements of the Lords Supper, whose use was to 'put us in Remembrance of Christ. No other Figure or Type being 'chosen by Christ, as able to Represent his being in the Flesh but this. 'This was an Honourable *Image* of his quickning Body made by himself; which he would not have of the shape of a man to prevent *Idolatry*; but of a common Nature, as he took upon him the common 'Nature of Man, and not any Individual Person; and as the Body of 'Christ was really Sanctified by the Divine Nature, so by Institution 'this Holy *Image* is made Divine through Sanctification by Grace.

2*d*. Of the same Fathers Arguments against the *Image* of any other: 'Because these being the chief, there can be less reason for any others 'besides; that there is no Tradition of Christ or his Apostles for them: 'no way of Consecration of them prescribed, or practised, no suitableness in the use of them to the design of the Christian Religion, which 'being in the middle betwixt *Judaism* and *Paganism*; it casts off the Sacrifices of the one, and not only the Sacrifices, but the *Idolatries* of the

other? and it is Blasphemy to the *Saints* in Heaven, to call in the
'*Heathen* Superstitions into Christianity, to honour them by: that it is
'unbecoming their Glory in Heaven to be set upon Earth in dull and
'and senseless *Images*: that Christ himself would not receive Testimony
from Devils though they spake truth; neither can such a Heathenish
'custom be acceptable to the Saints in Heaven, though pretended to be
'for their Honour. That nothing can be plainer in the Gospel than that
'God is a Spirit And will be Worshiped in Spirit and in Truth, to which
'nothing can be more contrary than the going about to honour God
'by Worshiping any *Image* of himself or his *Saints*. As to his 2*d*. the
Adoration of the *Host*. They can be no more excluded from *Idolatry* in
their Worshiping of it than the *Heathen*; for that they give *Adoration*
even to what they see in it is plain; and if that which according to them-
selves is nothing but the accidents, they are worse than the *Heathen* who
Worship only Substances.

2. They are not sure but they may be imposed upon so as to commit
Idolatry even in their own sense of it; for either through the Juggling or
carelesness of the Priest an unconsecrated Wafer may be presented to
them instead of a Consecrated one. And;

3*dly*. Seeing it has been proved, and has been the Opinion of all the
Ancient Church till about the 9*th*. Century, that the Bread and Wine
are not Transubstantiated into the Body and Blood of Christ, it must
of necessity follow that they are *Idolatrous* in Worshiping it.

When they are charged with *Idolatry* for Worshiping *Saints* and *Angels*
as also *Images*, they labour to shift the Argument by saying they give only
Douleia but not *Latria* which is due to God alone. But for all their sub-
tilty they cannot get one place in Scripture to bear them out in this Di-
stinction; for the Scripture uses them both indifferently, even when
speaking of the Worship due to God. But I desire that they will shew
us some ground for their Distinction, how many degrees of Worship
go to make up a *Douleia*, and how many a *Latria*; for as to their External
Adoration it is the same Posture when directed to an *Angel*, or *Saints*,
as when directed to God, their Affection and Zeal seems likewise the
same; nay, and their very External Words are likewise the same
asking things of an *Angel* after the same manner as if it were an Independ-
ent being, and consequently his Honour is given to the Creature. As
Brev. p. 224. in the *Antiphona* on the Apparition of *Michael* the *Arch Angel he is praid to come and help the People of God.* And in the Feast of the Guardian *Angel*, recommended to all *Catholicks* by *Paul* V. in the last words of the Brev-
iary: *They are praid to defend them in War, that they may not perish in Gods ter-*
Commun. Apost p 2.9. *rible Judgment.* In the Hymn to the Holy Apostles they are praid *to command the Guilty to be loosed from their Guilt, to heal unsound minds, and to en-*

crease

crease their Vertues, that when Christ shall come they may be partakers of Eternal Glory. The Reader may plainly see here that, it is not said *Pray to God for us*; which if they did, they were blameable enough; but do it for us, your selves, as if the Angels and Apostles were all Independent Beings. And I am sure such Absolute Worship as that is, cannot even in their own sense be termed *Doulia*; for they cannot express it in higher words to God himself.

2. Those Acts which presuppose in a Creature one of the highest Perfections we can conceive are *Idolatrous*. But so it is that the Invocating of Angels implyes one of the Highest Perfections we can conceive to be in them, for we must imagine that they know when we Invocate them, otherwise if we did not believe them to know and take notice what we said unto them we would not do it. And upon this supposition that they do hear us, we must Attribute to them the highest Knowledge which we can conceive; as suppose so many Persons at the same time pray from the most distant places of the Earth to St. *Michael*, *Peter*, *Paul*, &c. we must believe both that they hear those different Prayers of the Persons supposed to be in so distant places, and likewise that they can judge of theirr sincerity, for we cannot expect to have an Answer of our Prayers without our sincerity be known. Whereas the Scripture plainly says that God is the Judge of Hearts. And pray what higher Notion can we have even of Omniscience it self.

3. That Action which supposes God to be unmindful of his Servants, must needs be highly displeasing to him. But this praying to *Saints* to Interceed for them, supposes God to be unmindful, and that therefore he must be put in mind of it by *Saints* and *Angels*, and likewise that Christ is not so Faithful in his Mediatory Office as he should be. All which are notorious Blasphemies.

It may not be amiss here to set down some instances of the Fathers Opinions, as to the invocation of our Blessed Virgin, &c.

Epiphanius saith, *Maries Body was Holy indeed, but yet not God, she was indeed a Virgin and Honourable, but she was not propounded for Adoration, but herself Worshiped him, who as concerning his Flesh was Born of her.* *Contra Collyrid.*

Austin saith, *Let not the Worship of dead men be any Religion unto us, because if they have lived Holily, they are not to be accounted of, as that they should seek such Honour, but rather they will have him to be Worshiped of us by whom themselves being illuminated rejoyce, that we should be fellow servants of their reward. They are therefore to be Honoured for Imitation, not to be Worshiped for Religion sake.* *De vera Relig. c. ult.*

And again, *We honour them with Love, not with Service. Neither do we erect Temples unto them, for they will not have themselves so to be honoured of us, because they know that we our selves being good are the Temples of the High God.* *Ibid.*

And in another place, *Neither do we Consecrate Temples, Priest-hoods, Holy Rites, Cere-* *De Civ. Dei, l. 8. c. 27.*

Ceremonies, and Sacrifices unto the ſame Martyrs, ſeeing not they, but their God is our God &c. We neither Ordain Prieſts for our Martyrs, nor Offer Sacrifices.

In Rom. c. 1. Ambroſe ſaith, *They are wont to uſe a miſerable Excuſe, ſaying that by theſe Men we may have Acceſs unto God, as to a King by Earls. Go to, is any Man ſo Mad I pray you that being forgetful of his own Salvation, he will challange as fit for an Earl the Royalty of a King?* And a little after, *Theſe Men think them not guilty, that give the honour of Gods Name to a Creature, and leaving the Lord, Worſhip their Fellow Servants.*

Ibid.

Horn. Hiſt. Eccl. p. 102. &c. We ſhall now give a ſhort account how Images, were firſt, brought in as alſo the Invocation of Saints. And the firſt that brought in Images is *Paulinus* Biſhop of *Nola*, and *Sulpitius Severus*, (although before their time they had in ſome places Painted Images, as appears from *Epiphanius* Cutting the Vail whereon Chriſt was Painted) for *Hiſtorical* uſe, or Ornament of their Churches. But there is not the leaſt proof of any *Adoration* given them then; their only uſe at that time being Hiſtorical, Ethical, or Politick. Yet they are blameable for making that uſe of them; for that Hiſtorical uſe in a little time degenerated into *Idolatry*.

As to the Invocation of Saints, it owes its Original to the *Panegyrick* Orations, of St. *Baſil*, *Nyſſen*, and *Nazianzen*, who being Great Orators, uſed ſeveral Rhetorical Flouriſhes in their Declamations, ſometimes uſeing Compellations to the Dead as if they were preſent before them, and ſometimes imploring their Interceſſion, ſo that what they did meerly for Eloquence of Speech gave occaſion to the Unlearned to fall into that groſs Error.

In the days of the Emperour *Philippicus* a New Controverſie aroſe about the *Adoration* of Images; for this Emperour cauſed to remove the *Images* of *Chriſt*, *Mary*, and the *Saints* out of the Churches, and Ordained that none ſhould Worſhip them; the *Popes* of *Rome* ſtoutly maintained the *Adoring* of *Images*, and therefore Excommunicated the Emperour. The Original of this Controverſie was thus: When *John* a Monothelite Monk, was Elected Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, a Council was called there to Examine him as to his Doctrine, where he was Condemn'd of *Hereſie*. The *Pope* in Commemoration of this *Act*, cauſed the *Images* of all thoſe who were preſent at this Council be ſet up in the Porch of St. *Peter*: which occaſioned a Controverſie between the *Grecks* and *Latins*, the former avouching that they ſhould be *Abrogate* as deſtructive to Piety, and the latter maintaining them. *Leo Iſaurus* the Third Emperour of this Name being offended with this abominable *Idolatry* published an Edict *An.* 726. *That none ſhould Worſhip any Image. He alſo cauſed all Images be thrown down, Pictures be* Defaced, *and the Walls Whitened,*

Gregory

Gregory the Third when he heard thereof Excommunicated *Leos*, who Laughed at his Thundrings, saying, *He* is an *Idolator* and is Excommunicated himself, he was therefore called *Iconomachus*.

To him Succeded *Constantine Copronymus*, a great abhorrerof Images, who also calling the *7th.* General Council at *Constantinople*, Condemned the Worshipers of Images Idolaters, *&c.* caused all the Images be removed out of Churches and would not so much as suffer them to be used privately.

In the *2d.* Council of *Nice* 787. by the Influence of *Irene* and her Son *Constantine* the *6th.* it was decreed that Images should not only be kept for Historical use but also *Adored*, Saluted, *&c* This *Irene* caused the Body of *Constantine Copronimus* be Digged up, and publickly Burnt; and caused her Sous *Eyes* be put out, because he threw down some Images.

Upon hearing of the proceedings of this Council *Charles* the Great called a Council at *Frank-fort* 794. of 300 Bishops: whose chief business was the Controversie about *Images*; and they aproved their Historical use, but Condemned the Worshp of them, the *2d. Nicene* Council was rejected, and Writings published against that Pseud Council, which *Pope Adrian* in vain endeavoured to maintain. Yet in Progress of time it universally prevailed in the Church,

What gross Idolatrys they commit in their Prayers to the Blessed Virgin, the Reader may judge by the Formes they use to Invocate her by. in the present *Roman Breviary* restored aecording to the Council of *Trent* by several *Popes* you may Read, *Hail Blessed Virgin thou alone have Destroyed all Heresies in the World*, And again, *vouchsafe to let me praise thee O Holy Virgin, and give me strength against thy Enemies.* And in the Hymn frequently used in her Office and particularly on that day she is not 'only called the Gate of Heaven, but she is intreated to loose the Bonds 'of the Guilty; to give light to the *Blind*, and to drive away our evils, 'and to shew herself to be a Mother as in the Mass Book Printed at *Paris*, 1634. 'By the Authority of a Mother Command the Redeemer. They pray to her therein 'for Purity of Life, and a safe conduct to *Heaven*. Innumerable more might be mentioned, but these may suffice to inform a Judicious Reader more than to accumulate multitudes of *Arguments*. And all this Idolatry committed in the Addresses to her seems to proceed from a gross Notion of an Eternal State, to wit that those External Relations that proceed here from a Married State, such as Husbands and Wives, Parents and Children were in force in that Life of Blessedness; where as our Saviour himself says in his Answer to that unanswerable Objection (*as themselves thought*) of the Sadduces against the Resurrection of the Dead. *cm. Brev. A. 1653. P. 983.*

The Children of this World Marry and are given in Marriage; But they which shall

which shall be accounted worthy to attain that World and the Resurrection from the Dead, neither Marry nor are given in Marriage---For they are like unto the Angels, &c. Luke 20. 34, 35, 36. And if they are like unto the Angels then undoubtedly all those External Relations that have so much force here are there at an End. Had they considered our Blessed Saviours own words as to her, while one of the Multitude cried, Blessed is the Womb *that bare thee, and the Pap that gave thee Suck*; replying Yea rather Blessed are they that hear the Word of Gods and do it. And it is very Observable that when one came and told him *that his Mother and Brethren stood without desiring to speak with him, he Answered and said unto him that told him, who is my Mother? and who are my Brethren? He stretched forth his hand towards his Disciples, and said, Behold my Mother, and my Brethren. For whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in Heaven, the same is my Brother and Sister and Mother.* As also that in all places of Scripture where he is brought in answering her he prefaces it with this word *Woman.* By all which 'tis plain that our Saviour did plainly Caveate his Church against those dangerous Errors about his Mother, which have since crept into the Christian World to the unspeakable Dishonour of his Name and Stumbling block of *Jews* and *Mahumetans* and *Heathens*, which in all probability shall never be converted to their Lord and Saviour as long as such gross Errors are kept up by those that take upon themselves the Name of Christians. I shall conclude this Discourse in the words of that Religious and Learned Prince K. *James* the First, where speaking of the Controverses between us and the Church of *Rome*, he comes to that point of the Relicts of Saints. *But for the worshiping either of them or Images, I must? saith he, account it Damnable Idolatry; and adds, that the Scriptures are so directly, vehemently and punctually against it, as I wonder what Brain of Man, or Suggestion of Satan durst offer it to Christians; and all must be salved with nice and Philosophical Distinctions---, Let them therefore that maintain this Doctrine answer it to Christ at the Latter Day, when he shall accuse them of Idolatry; and then I doubt if he with be paid with such nice and sophistical Distinctions.*

K. James's Works p. 303.

FINIS.

c. 926
898

The Reasonableness of the

CHURCH of ENGLANDS

TEST,

And Justness, of Her REFORMATION,

Asserted in Answer to the

Bishop of Oxon's

(S. Parker's)

Fallacious, Reasons, and Precarious Assertions against it.

Also, the VVorship of IMAGES, *Adoration of the* HOST, *and Innovation of* SAINTS, *&c.*

Proved

IDOLATRY,

By the Catholick Doctrine of the Holy Scripture, the Ancient Fathers *and all Reformed Churches.*

By which the Writings of Dr. Stillingfleet, *Dr.* Tillotson, *Dr.* Moore, *&c. are Cleared from the Charge of* Anticatholick, Anti-christian, Fanatical, *&c.*

For it was not an Enemy that reproached me, then I could have born it, but it was thou a Man mine equal, my guide, and my acquaintance, Psal. 55. v. 12, 13.

Printed in the Year, M DC LXXX VIII.

Dupl. C. 9. 5. Line

TEST

AMong all the late Diſcourſes I have ſeen, there is none that affords Occaſion of greater Surprize, than that Intitl'd *Reaſons for Abrogating the TEST*, eſpecially if we conſider the Preſent Station of the Author, and his Difference in Opinion, while moving in a Lower Orb, and was labouring for Promotion. As to his preſent Quality, He is well known to be one of the Reputed Fathers of the Church of *England*, or Overſeers of the Flock of *Chriſt*, to preſerve it from all Falſe Doctrine, Hereſie, and Schiſm, *&c.* And therefore it cannot but be admir'd, that a Perſon who owes his Eccleſiaſtical Dignity to the Church of *England*, ſhould ſo meanly Condeſcend, as if he ſaw his Dignity in danger, to plead for *Tranſubſtantiation*, and the Church of *Rome*, againſt the Charge of *Idolatry*, maintain'd as well by all the Reform'd Churches in General, as by that Eſtabliſh'd by Law in theſe His Majeſty's Dominions! Which is no more than to proclaim to all the World, that the Church of which he is at preſent a Conſecrated Biſhop, is a Schiſmatical Church. And this only upon the account of making it an Argument to overthrow the *Teſt*, which debars the *Roman Catholick Peers* from ſitting in Parliament. Now that he ſeems to prove the Church of *England* to be Schiſmatical, in his making good his Argument againſt the *Teſt*, is plain; For he makes it his buſineſs to ſhew you, That *Tranſubſtantiation*, as it is decided by the Council of *Trent*, is a Doctrine which has always been acknowledg'd by the Church of *England*; and that the Church of *Rome* is not guilty of *Idolatry*. Which if true, the Church of *England* can never juſtifie her ſelf in her Separation from the Church of *Rome*. So that even *Varillas* himſelf, could hardly have been ſo diſingenuous as to have obtruded ſuch a Fallacy upon the World.

But we ſhall not further digreſs, but trace our Author, and try on what ſolid Grounds his New Diſcoveries inſiſt.

As to his firſt and ſecond Reaſons, I leave it to the Gentlemen of the Long Robe. Only I thought this old Saying might be inſerted,

Turpius ejicitur quam non admittitur Hoſpes.

As for his Third Reaſon, That this Law is of an Eccleſiaſtical Nature. I cannot conceive how making Acts what Perſons are to be admitted into Places of Truſt, can be of an Eccleſiaſtical Nature. It would ſeem that all Acts of an Eccleſiaſtical Nature, are either for the deciſion of ſome intricate point of Divinity, or for Enjoyning the decent performing of all things belonging to the Worſhip of God, or calling to account Page. 6.

 thoſe

those who are unruly, and walk disorderly, as the Apostle terms it, and Excommunicating such if Obstinate: But none of these can be said in the case of the *Test*. For here was no making of Decrees upon Divine Verities; that is, here was no Discussion of that Controversie of *Transubstantiation* and *Idolatry*, but only the Parliament supposing the *Protestant* Opinion in opposition to it, to have been a Truth received by our Church, and that upon Authority Competent, and continued for above a hundred Years, and that it was the only *Test* to distinguish one of the Church of *Rome* from one of our own Communion, and therefore enjoyned, that none should be admitted to sit in Parliament, or bear any publick Charge, but such as disowned *Transubstantiation*, &c. which is as much as to say, We order that none sit in Parliament, or bear any publick Charge, but such as disowned *Transubstantiation*, *&c.* which is as much as to say, We order that none sit in Parliament, *&c.* but those who are by Profession of the Church of *England* as it is now Established by Law. But this Argument being so Trivial, the very naming of it seems a sufficient Refutal; We therefore proceed to that he insists so much upon, and by which he seems rather to have designed to support the tottering Cause of the Church of *Rome*, than to impugn the *Test*.

Pag. 9. His Fourth Reason why it ought to be Repealed, is, *Because of the Uncertainty and Falshood of the Matters therein contained*: As first, *That there is no Transubstantiation in the Sacrament of our Saviours Body and Blood.* And secondly, *The Invocation of Saints and the Mother of God is Idolatry.*

The Reverend Author follows exactly the Method of those he takes upon him to defend. Which is first to begin to bespatter those whom he alledges were Promoters of the *Test*.

He begins first to shew the Evil of imposing the Abjuration of *Transubstantiation*, and makes a great Bustle to shew the Unreasonableness of imposing an Oath, the Contents whereof are so abstruse, that it is hardly possible for Noblemen especially to come to the understanding of them. And to make his Putt good, he makes a very long Digression on the Notions of the several Schoolmen about *Transubstantiation*; where he ever and anon drops precarious Assertions, to wit, that the Catholick Church in all Ages, maintained the Real and Substantial Presence; but we meet not with any shew of Proof thereof. It seems he thinks the old αὐτὸς ἔφη is enough, that *his* Affirmation is evidence enough to prove the Truth of any thing. One would almost admire what he means in setting down those wild Notions of *Scotists*, *Nominalists*, &c. And indeed it can be with no other design than to confound his Reader; Yet in the end he gives you the Description of *Transubstantiation*, as it is in the 4th Chapter of the 13th. Session of the Council of *Trent*, in these words:

Page 25. "By the Consecration of the Bread and Wine, there is a Conversion of "the whole substance of the Bread into the substance of the Body of "*Christ*, and of the whole substance of the Wine into the substance of his "Blood,

" Blood ; which Converſion is fitly and properly called by the Holy Ca-
" tholick Church, *Tranſubſtantiation.*

Now what moved him to rail ſo much againſt the Impoſers of the *Teſt*, as impoſing Propoſitions which Noblemen could not poſſibly underſtand? For certainly they muſt be of very mean Capacities who cannot underſtand the Deciſion of that Infallible Church in this affair, and that goes beyond all the particular Notions of Schoolmen, and is the Rule to which they are all to ſubmit. It ſeems our Author has a very mean Opinion of the Nobility, while he ſo confidently averrs, that they neither *do* nor *can* underſtand it. For it is propoſed in as plain and obvious terms as can be, though I confeſs a man muſt put a ſuſpenſion (for that time at leaſt) to Senſe, Reaſon, and Religion, to believe it; and may therefore the eaſilier and ſafelier ſwear againſt it.

He proceeds to give you the Opinions of the ſeveral Communions differing from the Church of *Rome*; And he firſt begins with the *Lutherans*. But what he ſpeaks as to their Sentiments, we purpoſely wave. Seeing though they differ from the Church of *Rome* in that point, yet their Church differs vaſtly in her Opinion from all other Proteſtant Churches; yet they do not in the leaſt own, that the Bread and Wine are tranſubſubſtantiated into the Body and Blood of *Chriſt*. *Pag.* 28.

Whereas our Author ſays, that the *Helvetian* Miniſters maintained the Real Preſence, we have Inſerted the following paſſage out of their Confeſſion. " We do not then ſo joyn the Body of the Lord and his Blood " with the Bread and Wine, as tho we thought that the Bread is the Bo-" dy of Chriſt more than after a Sacramental manner, or yet that the " Body of Chriſt doth lye hid corporally under the Bread, ſo as it ought " to be worſhipped under the form of Bread, or yet that he that recei-" veth the ſign receiveth alſo the Thing it ſelf. The Body of Chriſt is in " the Heavens, at the right hand of his Father, *&c.* *Pag.* 31. *Helvet. Confeſſ.*

And he affirms, that the *Bohemian Waldenſes declare expreſly, Bread and Wine are the very Body and Blood of Chriſt.* The Reader may pleaſe to take notice of theſe words in their Confeſſion, " Wherefore this Speech, " *Bread is the Body, and Wine is the Blood of Chriſt*, is a Sacramental Speech, " to wit, that theſe two diſtinct things, do remain the ſelf ſame thing " which in their own nature they be, and yet by reaſon of a Sacramental " Union, or Sacramentally, they be that alſo which they ſignifie, and " whereof they do teſtifie——— Now both good and bad uſe this Sa-" crament, yet the true Believers receive it to Life, and the Unbelievers " to Condemnation: And tho both receive it outwardly, yet the Belie-" vers do receive it Spiritually, and ſo to their Salvation. Nothing like, The Bread and Wine are the very Body and Blood of Chriſt here. *Page* 29. *Confeſſ. Bohem.*

And the Reformed French Church confeſs, that in the Lords Supper, not only all the Benefits of Chriſt, but his very Fleſh and Blood are there exhibited to us; in the French Confeſſion you may find theſe Words, " For altho " he *Pag.* 37. *Confeſſ. Gall.*

" he be now in Heaven, and ſhall remain there till he come to judge " the World; yet we believe that by the ſecret and incomprehenſible " Vertue of his Spirit, he doth nouriſh and quicken us with the Subſtance " of his Body and Blood being apprehended by Faith. But we ſay " that this is done Spiritually, *&c.* Not a word of Tranſubſtantiation here.

Pag. 37. Then he proceeds to *Calvin*, and would make the World believe that he likewiſe owned it. Whereas it's plain that he mean'd nothing elſe but a Spiritual Preſence and a Spiritual Nouriſhment to the worthy Receivers. But becauſe our Author thinks he has got an Argument *ad hominem* againſt *Calviniſts*, I ſhall only ſet down a little from ſome of the follow Paragraphs, and then let any one judge how the Words he cites, can be Interpreted in his ſenſe.

Calv. Inſtit. L. 4. C. 17. Sect. 12. " And firſt, truly we muſt not dream of ſuch a preſence of Chriſt in " the Sacrament, as the Sophiſters of the Court of *Rome* have invented; " as if the Body of Chriſt locally preſent, were touched with our Hands, " broken with our Teeth, and ſwallowed with our Mouth. For Pope " *Nicholas* caus'd *Berengarius* to make this Form of Recantation. And *Sect. 14.* " *Sect.* 14. Hence ſprung that *Tranſubſtantiation*, for which the *Romaniſts* " contend more eagerly at this day, than for all other the Articles of " their Faith——— But it is a wonder that Men deviate into ſuch Stupi- " ty and Ignorance, as to bring forth ſuch a Monſter of Opinion, not " only contrary to the expreſs meaning of the Scripture, but the univer- " ſal Conſent of the Ancient Church. Many more might be ſet down, but by theſe the Reader may ſee what a Champion *Calvin* has been for *Tranſubſtantiation*. And by this the Reader may judge what weight is to be laid as to the pretended acknowledgments of other Proteſtants in this point. But to take notice of all his Raileries againſt ſeveral Proteſtant Writers, would be too much labour, eſpecially ſeeing any Intelligent Reader may eaſily diſcover them. Our Author afterwards falls foul of *Beza*, but Railery being his Talent, we muſt give him his way.

From all theſe Premiſes, he ſays, *That no one thing in the World is more unfit to be ſet up for a Teſt, than Tranſubſtantiation.* I wonder what he means? Has he found out any Churches acknowledging *Tranſubſtantiation* as it is held by the Church of *Rome*? He has a ſtrange way of arguing; but his Argument ſhould run thus, Becauſe all Proteſtants acknowledge a kind of preſence of a Spiritual Nature, and which they profeſs themſelves that they do not determine what it is: Therefore it is a moſt unreaſonable thing to impoſe *Tranſubſtantiation* a thing plainly determined by the Church of *Rome*, as Matter of Abjuration, and then his Argument would loſe all its ſtrength. Nor does any thing in the *Teſt* contradict the Opinion of any Proteſtants, ſo as it ſhould be ſtyled by our Author, *A Defiance to Chriſtendom*. For it only ſwears againſt that Real Preſence which is maintained by the Church of *Rome*, and conſiſts in the Conver-

Converſion or Tranſubſtantiation into the Body and Blood of Chriſt after the Prieſts muttering the words, *This is my Body.*

The Church of England, he ſays, *agrees with the Tradition of the Catholick Church both Roman and Reformed in Aſſerting the certainty of the Real Preſence.* A mighty Reconciler o' my word! We always thought that there was a vaſt difference between us; but it ſeems our Author has had the happineſs to end differences above any that have ever been before him. Pag. 46.

But he comes in with his Exceptions, *tho the true account of it hath been miſerably perplexed and diſturbed by the Oblique Practiſes of the Sacramentarians.* Bene aſſeris Domine, male probas. Ibid.

And to make good his accuſation, he Libels Dr. *St.* as guilty of ſoiſting in ſome Inviſible Manuſcript for his Opinion; for his words ſeem to import ſo much. But *Quære*, Why the Learned Author held his Peace ſo long, when a Truth of ſuch Conſequence has ſuffer'd ſo much by his ſilence? He will give us a ſhrew'd Reaſon to ſuſpect that he aims more at Preferment than diſcovery of Truth, elſe he would have mentioned theſe things before now. But how could theſe things be if the Real Preſence were the general Opinion, not only of our Church, but of all the Proteſtant Churches? He goes on as much as he can to beſpatter the Church whereof he pretends to be a Member, as ſuffering ſo many Innovations to be brought into her. And yet who thoſe Innovators were he cannot tell; for ſays he (*whoever they were.*) A very probable buſineſs that Innovations ſhould be brought in contrary to the general ſenſe of a Church, and yet no body ſhould know by whom. One would almoſt think by his arguing, that he had learned a little of the Mahumetan Sophiſtry. But let us hear what Innovations were brought in. *It was made*, ſays he, *in the 5th Year of the Kings Reign, tho preciſely when and by what Perſons is not known.* It may be our Author has this from ſome Inviſible Manuſcript. For it is more like, that ſuch a Tale in a Tub as this is ſhould be of ſuch Original, than that of Dr. *St.* It is no wonder if we cannot give a particular Account of what Corruptions were brought into the Church at a far greater diſtance of time, if our Author is to ſeek to make thoſe appear that were ſo lately brought in. One thing is very much worth the Obſerving *that* Calvins *Correſpondency with the Protector gave a fatal blow to the Reformation.* It is ſtrange if *Calvin* brought in this Innovation as to the Real Preſence, when our Author pretends to bring him in above ſo much for it. I will not ſay he contradicts himſelf, but leave it to the Reader to Judge. But he goes on, They appoint this *Zuinglian* Form, *Take and eat this* (without mention of Body and Blood) *in remembrance that Chriſt died for thee.* I wonder how our Author can carp at this when it is almoſt the very words of our Saviour, *Do this in Remembrance of me.* And he goes on further that they were not ſatisfied with the alteration of the Old Form, but added a fierce Declaration to bar the Doctrine of Real and Eſſential Preſence, which ſee in the Rubrick after the Communion, and our Author ſets it down at large. Our Author is of a very moderate Temper, who rather than want an Argument that Noblemen ſhould not be impoſed upon to ſwear to Intricacies and Falſhoods, will render the Church he pretends to be a Member of Infamous; for ſo ſhe muſt be if what he ſays be true, that ſhe ſuffered ſuch Innovations to be brought in contrary to her own and the ſenſe of all Reformed Churches. But what proof for all this? Nay for that he thinks himſelf of ſuch unqueſtionable Authority, that if he once ſay it, no Man ſhould doubt of it. However I find he is very good at the old trick of Pag. 47. Pag. 51. Pag. 52.

One would almoſt think this a bold practice in a bold Writer thus to impoſe things which look ſo like Forgeries upon the World. Nay one could ſcarce think it lookt like ſenſe to call that an Innovation, which according to his own Conceſſion was brought in but in the 5th Year of K. *Edward* the VI. Reign, and conſequently of the Reformation; unleſs our Author would likewiſe ſay that the whole Proteſtant Doctrine was an Innovation. Eſpecially ſeeing neither could they whoſe Office it was to Reform, ſee through all things at firſt view; nor poſſibly, would they bring in all things requiſite for a through Reformation at firſt, but firſt inform the Peoples Underſtandings as to the ſeveral groſs Errors of the Church of *Rome*, that ſo they might remove the unjuſt Prejudices they might have had againſt them, which might have occaſioned great Diſturbance had they been at firſt Enacted.

Pag. 53. Dr. *Burnet*, ſays he, *has often heard it ſaid, that the Articles were fram'd by* Cranmer *and* Ridley; *but whoever told him ſo, knew no more than himſelf*: and whoever tells him that it's not ſo, knows as little; and one would think, that he who contradicts an Hiſtorian, ſhould bring at leaſt as ſtrong Reaſons for it, as he whom he contradicts: And yet all that our Author brings to make his Charge good, is a Conjecture: For he ſays in the very next Paragraph; *All that can be conjectured, is*, &c.

Pag. 58. He ſays, "That in the beginning of Queen *Elizabeth*'s Reign, when the Re-"formation was ſetled in that ſtate in which it ever after continued; and that "new Declaration of the ſecond Liturgy of King *Edward*, &c. was rejected, "and the firſt old Form of Diſtribution was reſtored, *&c.* But if ſo, how comes it that our Author has produced no Inſtances of it from thoſe who were then living? And how comes it that that Declaration is ſtill extant in the Rubrick, that they acknowledge no Preſence, ſave only after a Spiritual manner?

pag. 58, 59, &c. He pretends that the moſt famous Divines of our Church, were ſtiff Avouchers of his Real Preſence, and Inſtanceth in Biſhop *Andrews*. But what he inſtanceth out of him, makes very little for his purpoſe, as appears by theſe words in his Citation: *Only we define nothing raſhly of its* modus, *neither do we curiouſly enquire into it, no more than how the Blood of Chriſt cleanſeth us in our Baptiſm.* Now ſeeing the Learned Biſhop ſays that he will not curiouſly enquire into it no more than how the Blood of Chriſt cleanſeth us in Baptiſm, and that is by all underſtood in a Spiritual ſenſe (for no Church affirms that the Blood of Chriſt muſt enter into our Bodies for the cleanſing us) it muſt needs follow, that he likewiſe underſtood the Preſence of Chriſt in a Spiritual ſenſe, and conſequently had no reſpect to a Corporal Preſence. And whereas he alledges Biſhop *Poinet* is of the ſame opinion, our Author would have done well, if he had read over that Citation of him in the Biſhop of *Durham*'s Hiſtory of *Tranſubſtantiation*, and he would have found theſe words at the cloſe of it: *Laſtly, he affirms, according to the unanimous conſent of the Fathers, That this Matter muſt be underſtood in a Spiritual ſenſe, baniſhing all groſſer and more carnal thoughts.* And what theſe words import, let any man judge.

Hiſt. Tranſubſtantiation, p. 10.

Art. 8. p. 283. Art. 14. p. 368. & 382. But becauſe our Author is ſo much for Inſtances, I ſhall likewiſe ſet down a few. The firſt is that of the Famous Biſhop *Jewel*, in his Anſwer to *Harding*; who proves, *That to give the honour of God to a Creature, is manifeſt Idolatry, as the Papiſts do in the Adoration of the Hoſt*, &c. Which he would never have attempted, had he been for the Corporal Preſence.

Diſp. of Chriſtian

and the Worshipping of them was ever wicked by the judgment of Christs Church, &c. 2. *In the Adoration of the Host*; of which he Treats at large.

A third is of Bishop *Taylor*, in these words: "Now by this Spiritual Presence "of Christ, we understand Christ to be present, as the Spirit of God is present "in the Hearts of the Faithful, by Blessing and Grace; and this is all that we "mean, besides the Tropical and Figurative presence. And p. 14. We say "Christs Body is in the Sacrament Really, but Spiritually; our meaning is, "that it is present to our Spirits only; that is, so as Christ is not present to any "other sense, but that of Faith, or spiritual susception. And p. 13. In the Sacra- "ment is given us the true substance of Christs Body or Flesh, but not Carnally, "but Spiritually; that is, not to our *Mouths*, but to our *Hearts*; not to be chew- "ed by *Teeth*, but to be eaten by *Faith*. And p. 7. The Doctrine of the Church "of *England*, and generally of the *Protestants* in this Article, is this, That after "the Minister of the Holy Mysteries hath rightly prayed, and Consecrated the "Bread and Wine, the Symbols become changed into the Body and Blood of "Christ, after the Sacramental, that is, in a Spiritual Real manner; so that all "that worthily Communicate, do by Faith receive Christ really, effectually to "all the purposes of his Passion, the Wicked receiving not Christ, but the bare "Symbols only. *Real Presence*, p. 15.

Our Author *after all*, thinks he has made his Adversaries quit the Field, and *leaves it to the Ingenuity of Mankind, to judge whether any thing can be more barbarous, than to make the Renouncing a Mystery so universally received, a State TEST.* (Not so barbarous neither, as to punish Dissenters with *Pillories, Whipping-Posts, Rods, Axes, Scourges, &c.)* And yet when he done his utmost, there is not one of all the above-cited, either Persons or Communities, save our dear Brethren of the Church of *Rome*, that approves of *Transubstantiation*, or the Conversion of the Bread and Wine into the very Body and Blood of *Christ*; which is the Particular swore against in the *Test*. pag. 82.

He charges the Sacramentarians with profane Boldness, for insisting on the Natural *Impossibility* of the Thing it self to the Divine Omnipotence, and so of prescribing Measures to the Divine Attributes: But he might as well say one were profanely bold, that should affirm, That it were not possible even to Divine Omnipotence, that the Author *Of the Reasons for Abrogating the Test*, should at the same minute of time, both Write in favour of the *Papists* and not write in favour of the *Papists*, i. e. that it is impossible that our Author can at the same Individual Minute of time write for them and not write for them. For the other has been proved as manifest a contradiction as this is. pag. 64.

We shall not trouble the Reader with further tracing our Author as to this Point, it being a hard matter to find him any where. But shall briefly give an account of the rise of Transubstantiation, and then shew its Repugnancy to Scripture and Reason.

About the Year of our Lord 900, horrible darkness overspread the Church of Christ: Nothing of soundness either in Doctrine or Manners, the Popes, Bishops, Priests were Rude, Flagitious, Wicked, whence, that Age by Writers was called *Unhappy, Sad* and *Miserable*. In so great Darkness what wonder is it if the grossest Errours prevailed? Then began that Opinion of *Oral Eating* of the Body of Christ in the Holy Supper. For *Paschasius Ratbertus* Abbot of *Corbia*, and *Amalarius* Bishop of *Trevir*, introduced a kind of Substantial Conversion & Presence. *Rabanus Maurus* Archbishop of *Montz*, and *John Erigena* a *Scot*, a very Learned Man, who acknowledged only a Figurative Sense of the Words, which latter while he oppos'd that gross Manducation was Stabb'd by his Schollars with a Penknife at the Instinct of the Monks.

in the Bread and Wine not Substantially, *but* Sacramentally, and so rejected the *Carnal Presence* and *Oral Manducation*, tho he uttered it in harsh and undigested expressions; *Lanfranc* vigorously opposed him, but chiefly upon this ground, *That he was a Heretick, because he dissented from the Church of* Rome. *Berengarius* was condemn'd in a Synod at *Vercelles* under *Leo* IX. and at last under *Nicholas* II. in the *Lateran* Council in the Year 1059. through human Infirmity he revoked his Opinion, but being toucht with remorse, he wrote against that Revocation. Notwithstanding that Heresie took root in the Church.

St. Bern. A. 1120. *Serm. de cœna Domini Joh.* 6.56--63. *Serm. de Purif. B. Mariæ. Serm. de S. Mart. In Exod. l.* 2. *c.* 10. *Christ Agric. in Antipist. p.* 13.

Berengarius being dead, the True and Ancient Doctrine he maintained, did not die with him. For it was still constantly maintained by St. *Bernard*, Abbot of *Clairvaux*, who lived about the beginning of the 12. Century. In his Discourse on the Lords Supper, he joyns together *the outward Form of the Sacrament, and the Spiritual Efficacy of it.* And in his Sermon on the *Purification*, which none doubts to be his, he says, *The Body of Christ in the Sacrament, is the Food of the Soul, not of the Belly; therefore we eat him not Corporally, but in the manner that Christ is Meat, in the same manner we understand that he is eaten.* And in his Sermon on St. *Martin*; *To this day*, saith he, *the same Flesh is given us, but Spiritually, therefore not Corporally.*

About the same time *Rupertus*, Abbot of *Tuitium*, taught also the Bread in the *Eucharist* is not converted: His words are these; *You must not attribute all to the Operation of the Holy Ghost, who never spoils or destroys any Substance he useth, but to that natural Goodness it had before, adds an invisible Excellency which it had not.*

Otho, Bishop of *Frisingen*, a Man every way Famous, lived in the same Age; and he also believed, and writ, *That the Bread and Wine remain in the Eucharist.*

As for the word *Transubstantiation*, it's hardly to be found before the middle of this Century: For the first that m ntion it, are (a) *Petrus Blesensis*, who lived under Pope *Alexander* the 3d. and (b) *Stephen Eduensis*, whose Age and Writings are very doubtful.

(a) *Ep.* 140
(b) *de Sacr. Altaris in B. patrum.*

In the 13. Century the Bishop of *Rome* began to exalt himself, not only over the Universal Church, but even over all the Empires and Kingdoms of the World. New Orders of Friars sprung up in this Age, who disputed fiercely against many Doctrines of the Antient and Purer Church, and amongst the rest, against that of the Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ. So that now there remained nothing but to Confirm this new Tenet, and impose it so peremptorily in the Christian World, that none durst hiss against it. This Pope *Innocent* the Third bravely performed. Who succeeding *Celestine* the 3d. at 30. years of age, and following briskly the footsteps of *Hildebrand* called a Council at *Rome* in St. *John Lateran*, & was the first that ever made the New-devised Doctrine of *Transubstantiation*, an Article of Faith necessary to Salvation.

In Hist. Joan Regis Angliæ. Mat. Par. in Hist. Min. in Platin. in Vit. Innoc. 3.

This is that *Innocent*, who to enlarge his Authority, wrought great Troubles to the Emperor *Philip*; stript *Otho* the 4th. of the Empire; forced *John*, King of *England*, to yield up into his hand this Kingdom, and that of *Ireland*, and made them Tributary to the See of *Rome*. *He was proud and ambitious* (says *Mat. Paris*) *and ever ready to commit the most wicked Villanies, so he might be recompensed for it.* This was the Man, who in his *Lateran Council* pronounced that *Transubstantiation* should be made an Article of Faith; and when the Council would not grant is, did himself by his own Arbitrary Power, against which none durst open his Mouth. For those Canons which at this day go under the name of the Council, are none of his, but meerly the Decrees of Pope *Innocent*, first writ by him, & read in the Council, and disliked by many, and afterward set down in the Book of Decretals under certain Titles, by his Nephew *Gregory* the 9th.

Mat. Par. in Hist. ad An. 1215.

Having thus given a breif account of the rise of this gross Heresie, I shall now endeavour to shew the gross Absurdity of it by the following Arguments.

1. This Opinion makes *Christ* guilty of gross Nonsense in his Institution of the Holy Supper. For his words are; *Take, eat; this is my Body; do this in Remembrance of me.* Now if that Bread had been *Christs* real Body after Consecration, his saying, *Do this in remembrance of me*, must have been Egregious Nonsense. For we neither do nor can remember things present, the act of Memory or Remembrance being such as always respects a Thing absent or past.

2. This Opinion infers, that God deludes his Creatures, which so much as to think of him is most horrible Blasphemy. But if it were true, that after Consecration the Wafer and Wine were become the Body and Blood of *Christ*, then must it be of necessity said, that God deluded his Creatures, for he represents it to all the Senses, under the same appearance as before Consecration, and yet as they say, it is quite another thing; to wit, the Body and Blood of *Christ*. And can there be greater Juggling in the World than this would be? And suppose this to be a Damnable Mistake, should not he positively be the cause of their Sin, and consequently damn them for that which they had all the reason in the world to adhere to, seeing that they were to adhere to the testimony of their Senses, in so far as they were capable of perceiving Material Objects by

nor heart perceive, &c. For those things the Apostle speaks of, are things of an immaterial and spiritual Nature, which cannot by themselves make any Impression on the Senses, and besides, otherwise transcend the thoughts of Men, such as the Mystery of the *Trinity*: But that cannot be said of the *Body of* Christ, seeing Eyes have seen it, and as a Body, it could enter into the Heart of Man to conceive of it, as being finite.

3. A Sacrament or Sign, is different from that thing whose Sign and Sacrament it is. Now, they must all acknowledge, that the *Bread* and *Wine*, even after *Consecration*, (for before it cannot be called a Sacrament) is a Sacrament or Sign of the *Body* and *Blood* of *Christ*; therefore, even after Consecration, it is different from the *Body* and *Blood* of *Christ*. The Proposition is clear, for it is a notorious contradiction, to say the thing signifying, and the thing signified, are one and the same thing, and as much as to say, the thing signified, is not the thing signified, &c. which to any will appear.

4. If in Baptism, after Consecration, the Water is not turned into the *Blood* of *Christ*, then in the *Lords Supper*, the *Bread* and *Wine*, after Consecration, is not turned into the *Body* and *Blood* of *Christ*: But that in *Baptism*, the Water is not changed into the *Blood* of *Christ*, all are agreed, Therefore not in the *Lords Supper*. The Consequence is clear, For *Baptism* is the Initiating Sacrament, and begets as it were a new Creation in the Soul, or Regeneration, as our Saviour terms it, whereas by the *Lords Supper*, that Image that is Created is kept up; which is no greater work at least than the first creating of it. And if so be that that first change is begot in the Soul, without *Transubstantiating* the Water into the *Blood* of *Christ*, by the Power of God unknown to us, why should we assert that in order to the *Lords Supper*'s operating its blessed Effect upon the Soul, the *Bread* and *Wine* therein made use of, must be *Transubstantiated* into the *Body* and *Blood* of our *Lord*. For the Parity holds.

I shall add some Instances out of the Fathers, to shew that that Doctrine of the *Real Presence* (as the *Romanists* hold it) was not heard of in their days.

Theodoret says, *Jesus Christ hath Honoured the Visible Symbols with the Name of his* Body and Blood, *not in changing their Nature, but in adding the Grace.* Dial. 1.

The Bread of the Sacrament, saith *Chrysostome*, *is called Bread before it is Sanctified; but Divine Grace having Sanctified it by the Ministry of the Priest, it is no longer called* Bread, *but it is judged Worthy to be called the* Body of Christ. Epist. ad Cæsar.

Pope *Gelasius*, at the end of the Ninth *Century*: *Certainly*, saith he, *the Sacraments of the* Body and Blood *of* Christ, *which you receive, are something that is Divine; whence also it is, That by them we are made Partakers of the Divine Nature; and nevertheless they still retain the Nature and Substance of* Bread *and* Wine. Gelas. de duabus in Christo natur. ad Nestor. & Eutych.

A Council of the *East*, Assembled at *Constantinople*, *Anno* 754. declares, *That* Jesus Christ *Commanded us to offer the Image of his Body, a Thing chosen, to wit, the Substance of the* Bread. Concil. Const. in Act. Nicen. 2. Act. 6.

Innumerable more might have been produced, to prove that it was the constant received Opinion, even till the *Ninth Century*; For the first that ever Wrote against it, was, that *Paschasius Ratbertus*, made mention of above.

This gross Opinion had its Original from a gross and carnal Understanding of *Christ*'s Words, *John* the 6. And if any consider the occasion of that Discourse, they will find no such Doctrine designed by *Christ*; For it was occasioned from the *Jews* following *Christ*, because they had been filled by a *Miracle*. *Christ* tells them, *They must Labour for the true Food of the Soul*, to wit, Himself; and thence makes a comparison between *Bread*, which is the Food of the Body, and *Himself*, who is the

risheth, but that of the Soul endureth for ever; after the same manner that he spake of the *Living Water*, to the Woman of *Samaria*, *John* 4. And when the Multitude supposing him to mean by these Words, *Except ye Eat the Flesh, and Drink the* Joh. 6. 53. *Blood of the Son of Man, ye shall not have Life in you*; that they must Carnally and Orally Eat his very *Body*, which was then speaking to them; they lookt upon his Doctrine as Salvageness it self; and from that Time many went away from him: And while his Disciples themselves Murmured at it, he saith unto them, *Does this offend you?* Ver. 62. *What if you see the Son of Man go up where he was at first?* 63. *It is the Spirit that quickeneth, the Flesh profiteth nothing; The Words that I speak, they are Spirit and Life:* From which, it is plain, That he designed nothing less than this Oral Manducation; For the eating of Man's Flesh hath been among all Nations accounted abominable.

De Nat. Deor. 3. And hence, says *Cicero*, *When we call Wine*, Bacchus, *and our Fruits*, Ceres, *we use the common manner of speaking; but do you think any of us to be so Mad, as to account that which he Eats to be his* God?

And *Averrhoes*, a Famous Heathen Philosopher, who lived about the *Eleventh Century*, when this Monstrous Doctrine of *Oral Manducation* had a little obtain'd in the *Christian* Church, expressed himself thus against it: *I have enquired into all Religions, and have found none more fooliſh than the* Christians, *because that very* God *they Worship, they with their Teeth devour:* And concludes thus, *Because the* Christians *Eat what they do Worship, let my Soul go to the* Philosophers. Hence the *Mahometans*, as the highest Calumny they can cast upon us, reproach us, *As Devourers of our God.* Nay, they affirm, That by thus eating of his *Flesh*, the *Christians* use him worse than the *Jews* did, who Crucified Him; *Because*, say they, *it is more Salvage to Eat his Flesh, and Drink his Blood, than only to procure his Death.*

Apud Perron. de Euch. l. 3. c. 29. p. 973.

It is observable, That from some Hereticks of the *First Century*, the *Capernaists*, &c. gross Interpretation of the 6 *Chapter* of St. *John*'s Gospel, sprung that abominable Custom, of initiating them with a draught of an Infants Blood, and eating the Flesh of it; which Barbarous Custom is supposed to owe its Original to *Simon Magus*. And the *Heathens* of those days, charged the Practise of those Monstrous Hereticks on the True Church of *Christ*: Of which *Salvianus* saith thus, *They supposed that we were initiated into our Religion by two abominable Villanies, by* Incest *and* Murther: Incest *of the Holy* Matrons, *and* Murther *of* Infants; *who, they believe, were not only Butchered, but likewise Devoured by us.*

Lib. 4. de Providentia.

We next proceed to our *Authors* second Head, to wit, of *Idolatry*, where we shall first consider it as to Image Worship, and secondly as to Invocation of Saints, &c.

Pag. 69. 70. Our *Author*, first holds out what a damnable Sin this is; and truly, in that we agree with him. And therefore he takes it very Hainously; *Such an Indictment should be preferred against the greatest part of* Christendom; and truly if there were not strong Presumption at least for it, they were very much to blame of breach of Charity that attempted it.

But in this Case, we may justly say to the Author, *Medice cura teipsum*; for no Man could prefer a Bloodier *Indictment* against that best part of *Christendom* than he, while he said, *We Condemn neither* Turk *nor* Papist, *on any other ground than this, that the one gives Worship to a Lewd* Impostor, *the other, to a senceless piece of* Matter.

71. He desires, *Men would lay aside their Indecent Heats, and Soberly enquire into the Nature, and Original of* Idolatry: And concludes his Paragraph, with, *Wishing to* God *there be nothing worse at the bottom of it, seeing it has always been set up as the Standard against* Monarchy. I thought always that to be a more dangerous Standard set up against *Monarchy*, of the *Popes* takeing upon them to Excommunicate

Kings: Inferiour *Prieſts* and *Friers*, ſuch as, *Ravillac* and *Clement*, Murdering them (and yet the ſame Aſſaſſinates juſtified in their Barbarous Murder, by the *Popes* themſelves, or they are baſely Belyed) than any Notion of *Idolatry*. But, that our *Author* may remember, That, Men as *Loyal* as himſelf, and as far from being *Fanatical* or *Unlearned*, have entertained different Notions of *Idolatry*, from this I ſhall Inſert the following Paſſages.

Biſhop *Whitgift* ſaith, *I do as much miſlike the diſtinction of the* Papiſt, *and the intent of it, as any Man doth, neither do I go about to excuſe them from Wickedneſs, and* (*without Repentance and* God's *ſingular Mercy,*) *damnable* Idolatry. *There are three kinds of* Idolatry; *one is, when the true* God *is Worſhiped by other means and ways than he hath preſcribed, or would be Worſhiped. The other, is when the True* God *is Worſhiped with Falſe* God's. *The* third, *is when we Worſhip Falſe* God's, *either in Heart, Mind, or in external Creatures, Living or Dead; and altogether forget the Worſhip of the True* God. *All theſe three kinds are deteſtable, but the* firſt *is the leaſt, and the* laſt *the worſt. The* Papiſts *Worſhip* God, *otherwiſe than his Will is, and otherwiſe than he hath Preſcribed, almoſt in all points of their Worſhip; they alſo give to the Creature, that which is due to the Creature, and Sin againſt the firſt Table; yet are they not, for all that I can ſee or learn, in the third kind of* Idolatry. *Defence to the Anſwer of the Admon. Tr. 8. p. 152.*

Biſhop *Abbot*, in his Anſwer to *Biſhop*, affirmeth, *That the Church of* Rome, *by the* Worſhip of Images, *hath matched all the* Idolatries *of the* Heathens, *and brought all their Jugling devices into the Church; abuſing the Ignorance and Simplicity of the People, as* Groſly *and* Damnably, *as ever they did.* *Tom. 2. Pag. 1106.*

Arch Biſhop *Laud*, in his Conference, ſaith, *The Antient Church knew not the Adoration of* Images; *and the Modern Church of* Rome *is too like to* Paganiſm, *in the practice of it, and driven to Scarce Intelligible Subtilities in her Servants Writings, that defend it, and this without any Care had of Millions of Souls, unable to underſtand her Subtilities, or ſhun her* Practiſe. *Pag. 277.*

I hope our *Author*, will not call theſe Learned Writers *Fanatical*, *Unlearned*, or *Uncharitable*, &c. And yet they here prefer a Bloody Indictment againſt the greateſt part of *Chriſtendom*.

To paſs by his Notions, at the firſt Corruption of the World, by *Idolatry*, He ſays, *As ſoon as the* Iſraelites *ſat down at the Foot of Mount* Sinah, God's *care was to make further proviſion againſt* Idolatry, *where he gives the* Ten Commandments; *whereof the firſt four, are directly levelled againſt* Idolatry. *Let us ſee how he makes good his Argument.* *Pag. 77.*

Firſt, ſays he, *He enjoyns the Worſhip of himſelf, who, by his Almighty Power, has delivered them from their* Egyptian *Bondage.* *Ibid.*

Obſerve, how Candidly our *Author* Comments upon the Firſt *Commandment*, ſetting down only the Poſitive part thereof, whereas it has alſo a Negative Senſe, as appears from the very Words. *Thou ſhalt have no other* God's *before Me.* And this is a very cunning Artifice of his; the moſt probable way to explain it, ſo as to vindicate them from the charge of *Idolatry*: For if this *Command* run only *Poſitive*, and the ſecond *Negative*, then he would have a very great advantage: The *firſt* would run ſo, *Thou ſhalt pay me that Worſhip that is due to me*: And the *ſecond*, thus, *Thou ſhalt not pay that Worſhip which is due to me, to any* Graven Image.

Had the *Romaniſts* thought of this way of maintaining the firſt and ſecond *Commands* to be different, ſo as to be yet free from any charge of *Idolatry*, in their Worſhipping of *Images*, they might have freed themſelves of that ſuſpicious Guilt, incurred by expunging the Second: For it argues a Guilt in them, in ſo far at leaſt, that they fear the Common People would take that to be the plain and obvious Meaning

of it; which we maintain, and consequently might suspect them of Jugling in this point. And I humbly think, our *Author*, seeing he is so much in their Vindication, that he might have said somewhat in their Justification, as to that Cancelling of the Second *Commandment*; especially when there lies so heavy a Curse upon those, who either add to, or diminish from the Law of *God*.

But that his Notion will not hold Good, appears by the Words themselves, *Thou shalt have no other* God's *before me*: That is, I am the only True *God*, who Created the World, and all things therein; preserve them by my Omnipotent Arm, and besides those common Providences, have manifested a particular Care over you, in bringing you out of the Land of *Egypt*; and expect that you especially Worship and Adore me, and none but me: And so, here the Lord sheweth them the True Object of Worship; to wit, that it is neither *Sun*, *Moon*, nor *Stars*, &c. but himself alone; and consequently prohibits in this *Commandment*, the Adoration of *Sun*, *Moon*, and *Stars*, and all other false *Goa's*.

Our *Author* is no less Ingenuous in his Explication of the Second *Command*, for he leaves out the most material Word in it, *Make*, which very Word will Mar his True, and only Notion of *Idolatry*; to wit, Worship of the *Sun*, &c. For, certainly *God* would not forbid them to make the *Sun*, for that was above their Power. Nor, *Secondly*, can he be said here meerly to forbid making an *Image* of the *Sun*, as a Symbol of it; for the Worship of the *Sun* it self, being forbid in the *First Command*, as also all other false Deities; none could be so Brutish, as to imagine that *God* would take up a New *Commandment*, in forbidding to make or Worship the Image of those false Deities. It remains therefore, That the Second *Commandment* must run thus, *Thou shalt not make any Representation or likeness of Me, nor shalt Worship me, by any likeness or Representation of me, by any thing that is in Heaven, on Earth, or in the* Waters *under the* Earth; which was as plain as could have been said, *Ye shall make, nor bow down to no Representation or likeness whatsoever.*

Deut. 4. 5. And, That this is the scope of this *Commandment*, may further appear, from *Deut.* 4. 15, 16, 17, 18, 19 where the Lord himself explains that *Command*, ver. 15. *Take ye therefore good heed unto your selves*: [As if he had said, I know you are strangely byast from the True way of Adoring me, which I have appointed; and are very prone to set up a way after your own Invention; to wit, by making a visible Representation of me, which is highly derogatory to my Glory; and therefore I warn you, over and over again, take heed to your selves] (*for you saw no manner of similitude, on the day that the Lord spake unto you out of* Horeb, *out of the midst of the Fire.*) q. d. Had I design'd that you should make any External Likeness or Similitude, or Representation of Me, I would have appeared to you in some Similitude, and appointed you to Worship me under that Similitude; but I did it not, and I do hereby shew you, That I did not appear to you in any Similitude, that you might not presume to Worship me, under any Similitude, which is so odious to me. *Ver.* 16. *Lest you corrupt your selves, and make you a Graven*
16. Image, *the similitude of any Figure, the likeness of Male and Female*, 17. *The like-*
17. *ness of any* Beast *that is on the* Earth, *the likeness of any winged* Fowl, *that is on the* Earth; *the likeness of any thing that creepeth on the Ground*, &c. A sufficient enumeration of all the kinds of likenesses, and does necessarily import thus much, Thou shalt make no *Graven Image*, nor no likeness of any Thing, to make use of in those Acts of Adoration which are due to me, as I am Soveraign Creator of all
[18: Things, and your *God* by a special Relation. Then, *Ver.* 18. he proceeds to caution them to beware of a more gross sort of *Idolatry*, which strikes immediately

Heaven, and when thou seest the Sun *and the* Moon, *and the* Stars, *even all the Host of* Heaven, *thou shouldst be driven to Worship them, and Serve them, which the* Lord *thy* God *hath divided unto all* Nations *under the whole* Heaven. Nothing can be more plain, Than that there are two kinds of *Idolatry* forbidden here; to wit, *Lest you corrupt your selves, and make a* Graven Image; *and lest that thou seest the* Sun, *&c. thou* Worship *them, and* Serve *them*: And therefore, that of worshipping the *Sun, Moon,* &c. is not the true and only Notion of *Idolatry*: And if we observe the Order of the two sorts of *Idolatry*, mentioned above, they give us no small hint how the one dispossest People to receive the other, even on this account, as it is the Nature of all Sin, and particularly of this which *God* has declared to be so dishonourable to him, to darken the Powers of the Soul, and weaken the *Conscience*, which is that *Primum Mobile* in the Soul; and if pure, the whole Soul keeps right in its Motion; but if once defiled, the whole frame of the Soul turns into Confusion, and becomes Captive to the Sensitive Part, and then who knows what horrid Abominations the Soul may be guilty of. And it is likewise very usual with *God*, when People thus dishonour him, not only to withdraw his Holy Spirit from them, so as actually to harden them, as he did *Pharoah*, when he would not let his People go. This is clearly pointed at in *Act.* 7. 41, 42. *And they made a Calf in those Days, and Offered Sacrifice unto Idols, and rejoyced in the works of their own hands; then* God *turned and gave them up to worship the Host of* Heaven. Most plainly pointing at two sorts of *Idolatry*; and the one consequent upon another, as a just Punishment inflicted on them by *God*, for their dishonouring Him in making Symbols, and Representations of Him. I am afraid our Author's true, and only Notion of *Idolatry*, will scarce endure the *Test*.

I now proceed to his Comment upon the *Third Command*; and thus you have him: *The* English *of the Third*, says he, *if it were rightly Translated, runs thus*; Thou shalt not give the Name of the Lord thy *God* to a Vanity or Idol: A strange Version of it. I desire to know how by this Sense, on this *Command*, the Reverend *Author* will prove those Persons Guilty of *Perjury*, who gave Birth and Original to the *Test*. For, allowing of this Interpretation, they cannot be guilty of any Trespass against this Command; for they never gave the Name of God to a Vanity and Idols, at least it will be a hard matter for the Author to prove they did. But to wave this, I am sure the Debauches of the Nation, the Dammee's, that make it their constant Practice to tear the Sacred Name of God, must needs have a great Veneration for our Author; for they never had such favourable Entertainment from any that ever we heard of before; for in their common Oaths they do not give the Name of God to an Idol, and so were only traduced before by Anticatholick, Unchristian, and Fanatical Notions of Blasphemy, whereas they were guilty of no such thing. Would our Author put but such a Catholick and truly Christian sense upon three or four more of the Commandments, I cannot see but that Party were obliged to return Thanks to him from all parts of the Nation, for delivering them from those Torments the Fanatical Notions of Men about that they call'd Sin hath created to them. But by our Author's leave, however he pretends the *Septuagint* renders it; yet 'tis plain that there was never a generally receiv'd sense among the People of the *Jews*, as appears by their great Reverence to the Name of God, particularly that great Name by which he manifested himself, *viz. Jehovah*, which they pronounced but very seldom, and that upon very solemn occasions.

And tho our Author determines the only design of God in the Fourth Command- *Pag.* 79.
ment, to be only to keep People from Idolatry; yet I doubt not, but God had other

free from any sort of our Authors Idolatry, and yet be abhorred by God, like that People of whom our Saviour spake, *That drew to him with their Lips, but their Hearts were far from him.* And that Church in *Laodicea*, in the *New Testament*, could not be charged with *Idolatry*, and yet was loathsome in Gods account.

Pag. 81. He instances the *Golden Calf* set up by the *Israelites* in *Moses* absence, and he concludes, that it was nothing else than an old *Egyptian* Idol: But I would seriously ask our Author, how it could be possible that the *Israelites* did Worship the *Calf* as the Symbol of some *Egyptian* Deity, as our Author alledges. For first, the occasion of it was, not on the least pretence of Infidelity as to the true God, but only because *Moses* had been so long absent from them, and they knew not what was become of him, and therefore they bid *Aaron* make them Gods that should go before them. Now, it cannot be supposed, that they could have been so strangely stupid, as to have Worshipped the *Egyptian* Gods of that time, if we consider what manifold wonders the True God wrought for them in the Land of *Egypt*, how heavily he lay his Hand upon the *Egyptians*, and yet in the mean while preserved them from those Plagues; they could not then be ignorant that the God whom they Worshipped, was of infinitely greater power than those the *Egyptians* worshipped. And they could not have so soon forgot that great Deliverance he wrought for them at the *Red Sea*, when the *Egyptians* were Drowned; they could not certainly but be then sensible that the God they served, was of infinitely greater Power than those the *Egyptians* worshipped. And but a little before, the Law was promulgated with Thunderings and Lightnings: Is it possible they could so soon have shaken off the dread of that God who had appeared so terrible to them? And further, even at this very time, when this Image was made, he Miraculously fed them with *Manna*, they could not but remember that they were never fed so in *Egypt*, and so they could not but acknowledge that that great God was infinitely to be preferred before the *Egyptian* Gods. But that very passage above cited of St. *Stephen*, *They made a Calf in these Days, and Offered to the works of their own Hands*, (certainly then not to the Sun, for that was not the work of their Hands) *then* God *turned, and gave them up to Worship the* Host of Heaven. Now, how could it be said, that he gave them up to Worship the *Host of Heaven*, if they were guilty of that *Idolatry* then, when they Worshipped the Calf. *Lastly*, There is no Imitation given in the whole Story, that they fell into the Heathen *Idolatry*; for afterwards, when they fell into it, the particular Names of the God's are mentioned, as, *Baal-Peor*, *Moloch*, *Remphan*.

But here on the contrary, *Aaron* expresly proclaims *A Feast to the Lord*, and the People accordingly met, and Offered there usual Offerings; whereas, had it been the *Egyptian Idolatry*, their common Sacrifices would have been Abominations; they must not have Sacrific'd Sheep and Oxen as they were wont to do, as our *Author* himself acknowledges.

Our *Author*, next mentions the Calves set up by *Jeroboam*, 1 *Kings*. 22, 29, 27. And he saith, *Its plain, that these Calves were set up by him, as Idols or Symbols of a new or Separate Religion from the Tribe of* Judah. It is plain *Jeroboam*'s design was not to pervert the People from the Worship of the *True God*, to that of the *Heathen Idols*, but only divert the People of *Israel* from going to *Jerusalem*; fearing least if the People should Yearly go up to *Jerusalem* to Worship, they should be again reduc'd to their Allegiance, to *Rehoboam*, and so cast off his Usurpation. Now, the occasion of the Kingdoms coming to him, was from *Solomons* falling to *Heathen* [illegible] 1 *Kings* 11. 33. Which would make him more cautious of falling into it,

is given, 1 *Kings*, 11. 33. and the God he Worshipped particularly mentioned. But of *Jeroboam* it is only said, that he set up the Calves at *Dan* and *Beth*, and said unto the People, it is too much for you to go up to *Jerusalem*; *Behold thy* Gods, *O Israel, we have brought Thee up out of the Land of* Egypt, 1 *Kings* 12. 28. 29. How easie had it been for him to have said, that *Jeroboam* Worshipped the Gods of *Egypt*, had that been his intention? And *Jeroboam* would have argued much better, that they had hitherto been in a great mistake, concerning the *True God*, and not meerly as to the place of his Worship, which is all he speaks against; for he continued the same Feasts and way of Worship that were at *Jerusalem*.

But if this of *Jeroboam* is *Heathen Idolatry*, how comes the Sin of *Ahab* to be called so much greater than that of *Jeroboam*? How comes *Jehu* at the same time, to boast of his Zeal for the Lord, when it is said of him, that he departed not from the Sins of *Jeroboam*, *viz.* the *Golden Calves* of *Dan* and *Bethel*, 2 *Kings* 10. 16, 19. How comes the Prophet not to Reprove *Jeroboam*, for the Gods he Worshipped, but for the Altar; this was a very small Fault in respect of the former, had *Jeroboam* been guilty of *Heathen Idolatry*. And how comes the Worship of *God* to be preserved in the *Ten Tribes*, after their Captivity, when they still continued their Separation in Religion, from the Kingdom of *Judah*, 2 *Kings* 17. 28. For certainly, if the *Samaritans* had only desired Information concerning the Worship of the *God* of *Israel*, after the way of *Jerusalem*, they would have sent thither for it; But because they sent into the Land of the Captivity, for a *Priest*, to be sent to them; it is plain, the former differences still continued.

From all which, it's plain, that *Jeroboam* did not fall into *Heathen Idolatry*; and yet we see he is charged therewith in Scripture, tho' not *Heathen Idolatry*, like that of *Ahabs*, for it is said, *That he had done Evil above all that were before him*; *and had gone and made him other* Gods, *and* Molten Images, *to provoke* God *to Anger, and had cast him behind his Back*: Which charge, may sufficiently inform us how great a Sin this of Worshiping the True *God*, by *Images*, is. 1 *Kings* 14. 9.

The Second Head of Discourse, is, *That the* Gods *that they worshipped, at that time, were nothing but the Heavenly Bodies, or the* Sun, *or the Supream Deity.* Pag. 94.

But, how can it be supposed, that Men of Sense and Understanding should believe that to be a *God*, which is altogether void of it? And if the greatest Part of the World acknowledged such for *Gods* as had no Understanding, how could the Notion of the One Supream *God* be preserved among them?

Our *Author* goes about to Prove, That this was the Idolatry of the *Heathens*, Pag. 96. by the Testimony of *Eusebius*: But he might have remembred, That this Passage is extant in his *Third Book, De Prepar. Evang.* that the Prophecy seemed to think that the *Egyptians* looked not beyond the *Sun*, *Moon*, and *Stars*; yet he acknowledges, that they represented the Creator with an *Egg* in his Mouth. Now, if they acknowledged a *God*, how can it be said, That they Worshipped the *Stars*, without any Notion of Demonstration.

He brings in likewise *Diodorus Siculus*; but it seems he has not much Read him, or he would have been loath to have brought Him in, who makes so much against him; for in his First Book, after the Celestial *Gods*, he Treats of Men and Women Deified, of *Osiris*, *Isis*, and *Tryphon*; and says, That *Osiris* was equally Honoured with the Celestial *Gods*.

Eusebius in his Chronicles, saith, from the Testimony of *Berosus*. That tho' they Worshipped the *Sun*, under the Name of *Baal*, yet they believed a Supream *God*, whom they acknowledged to have produced all things. And by the Testimonies of *Plutarch* and *Zenophon*, the *Persians* owned a *God* above the *Sun*.

And

And *Macrobius* never affirm'd, That they had no Sense and Apprehension of a Supream *God*; but says in the beginning, that he speaks only of Sub-celestial *Gods*; and that the Antients believed that the *Sun* was Governour of the World. But where he speaks of the Supream *God*, he saith, That the Antients never made an Image of this *God*, because they thought him so far beyond our Conception. And so these several Authors, our Author quotes, do him very little Service in maintaining his True and Only Notion of *Idolatry*.

P. 135. Our Author says, It is no less Malice than Folly, to charge *Idolatry* upon all Christians of the *Roman* Communion. It consists, he says, of these Three Heads.

1. *The Worship of Images.* 2. *Invocation of Saints.*
3. *Adoration of the Host.*

And, whereas he imputes their making Images, from the Instance of the *Cherubims*: It is plain, there is a vast difference: For, as Idolatrous as the *Jews* were, they never paid any Worship to the *Cherubims*, as the *Papists* do, even by their own Confessions to *Images*. They never Invocated *Cherubims*, as the *Papists* do their *Crosses, Images, &c.* But in all their Acts of Worship, shewed that they paid no Worship thereto, by their continual use of this Expression: *Thou* God *that dwellest between the* Cherubims.

He saith, That if it follows that something more is required to make *Idolatry* than the use of *Images*, our Author has a particular Talent in the Art of *Sophistry*, through his whole Book, by foisting in Sentences of Ambiguous significations: For either by use of them, may be meant, a setting up of them in that Place; for Ornament, or by Vertue of a *Command*, without making any Application to them in Acts of Worship, as the *Jews* did in this Case; for it is more than certain, they would never have presumed to do such a thing, unless they had had a particular Command of *God*: Or it may be taken for an actual making use of them in Acts of Worship. In the former Sense, the *Jews* made use of the *Cherubims* in their Holy of Holies, but not in the latter; for it is plain, That they never directed any Act of Worship thereto; which, yet 'tis plain the *Papists* do. And if the *Jews* had done any such thing, *God* would have declared against it, and no doubt would rather cause them to be taken away, than had his Worship thereby polluted. A plain Instance of which we have in Scripture, in a thing no less of Divine Appointment than the Cherubims were; to wit, the *Golden Serpent*: For tho *God* appointed that to be kept, in remembrance of his curing them; and looking upon it, when they were stung by the Fiery Serpents, and likewise as a Type of our Saviour, as he himself declares to *Nicodemus*; yet when the People committed Idolatry therewith, the Good King destroyed it. By the way, I would ask our Author, whether they committed that Idolatry with it, which he says is the True and only Notion of Idolatry; to wit, if they Worshipt the *Sun* thereby? certainly he will not say that. And I hope he will not say, they Worshipt it self, so as to account it a *God*; for it is not probable, they could be so stupid in such a Good Kings Reign, especially when the Scripture does not say any such thing of them, with such a Sacred thing as that, even under the worst of their Kings, and those who were most prone to Idolatry. Nay, 'tis plain, That when they Worshipped strange Gods, they did not think there was any Divinity in the Image it self; and that hence they are called the *Gods* of the *Zidonians*, *Ammonites*, &c. Now, it is impossible that they could imagine that that Image, inclosed in their Temples, could be the Deity of that People whose Gods they Worshipt, but only that they set up an Image, to represent that GOD whom the *Ammonites*, &c. Worshipped. And it remains then, that they designed by it to Worship the LORD

and it may be paid such an honour to it as the *Popist's* term *Douleia* and seeing that was reckoned *Idolatry* by God, our Author will please to Pardon us if we do not receive his true and only Notion of *Idolatry*.

3. Our Author may be answered by one of his own Authors (and such as maintains no Anticatholick Unchristian Principles) *Thomas Aquinas*. His words are: 'They were not set up to be Worshiped but 'for the sake of some Mystery: *viz.* the *Sanctum Sanctorum* Resembled 'Heaven; the *Ark* as the Foot-stool of God who was Incomprehensible, 'and therefore no resemblance of him was there; the Mercy-seat his 'Residence; the Cherubims represented the Company of Heavenly 'Angels waiting on him, whom they were forbidden to Worship, since 'that was due to God alone.

Our Author comes off with a fair sham, *If it be no Idolatry to Worship towards an* Image, *after all their Frights they fairly give up the Cause to the Church of* Rome. Where again observe his Æquivocation, Worship towards an *Image*. For it may be either taken barely for Worshiping towards a place where the *Image* is, and without any respect to it, no more than they knew not of any *Image's* being there; no man will call that *Idolatry*; but that will do the Church of *Rome* no Service; Or it may be taken for Worship towards the *Image* it self, so as the Person directs himself immediately to the *Image* and pays it some Adoration, and that this is *Idolatry* hath been already evinced from Scripture: Nor has our Author for all his bustling vindicated her from the Aspersion of it. p. 125.

I shall only Insert an Argument or two out of the Fathers of *Constantinople*, the first is against *Images* thus 'That all the Representation of Christ allowed us by the Gospel, is that which Christ himself Instituted, in the Elements of the Lords Supper, whose use was to 'put us in Remembrance of Christ. No other Figure or Type being 'chosen by Christ, as able to Represent his being in the Flesh but this. 'This was an Honourable *Image* of his quickning Body made by himself; which he would not have of the shape of a man to prevent *Idolatry*; but of a common Nature, as he took upon him the common 'Nature of Man, and not any Individual Person; and as the Body of 'Christ was really Sanctified by the Divine Nature, so by Institution 'this Holy *Image* is made Divine through Sanctification by Grace.

2*d*. Of the same Fathers Arguments against the *Image* of any other: 'Because these being the chief, there can be less reason for any others 'besides; that there is no Tradition of Christ or his Apostles for them: 'no way of Consecration of them prescribed, or practised, no suitableness in the use of them to the design of the Christian Religion, which 'being in the middle betwixt *Judaism* and *Paganism*; it casts off the Sacrifices of the one, and not only the Sacrifices, but the *Idolatries* of the

 'other:

'other: and it is Blasphemy to the *Saints* in Heaven, to call in the 'Heathen Superstitions into Christianity, to honour them by: that it is 'unbecoming their Glory in Heaven to be set upon Earth in dull and 'senseless *Images*: that Christ himself would not receive Testimony 'from Devils, though they spake truth; neither can such a Heathenish 'custom be acceptable to the Saints in Heaven, though pretended to be 'for their Honour. That nothing can be plainer in the Gospel than that 'God is a Spirit And will be Worshiped in Spirit and in Truth, to which 'nothing can be more contrary than the going about to honour God 'by Worshiping any *Image* of himself or his *Saints*.

As to his 2*d*. the Adoration of the *Host*. They can be no more excused from *Idolatry* in their Worshiping of it than the *Heathen*; for that they give *Adoration* even to what they see in it is plain; and if they Worshipe that which according to themselves is nothing but the accidents, they are worse than the *Heathen* who Worship only Substances.

2. They are not sure but they may be imposed upon so as to commit *Idolatry* even in their own sense of it; for either through the Juggling or carelesness of the Priest an unconsecrated Wafer may be presented to them instead of a Consecrated one. And,

3*dly*. Seeing it has been proved, and has been the Opinion of all the Ancient Church till about the 9*th*. Century, that the Bread and Wine are not Transubstantiated into the Body and Blood of Christ, it must of necessity follow that they are *Idolatrous* in Worshiping it.

When they are charged with *Idolatry* for Worshiping *Saints* and *Angels*, as also *Images*, they labour to shift the Argument by saying they give only *Douleia*, but not *Latria* which is due to God alone. But for all their subtilty they cannot get one place in Scripture to bear them out in this Distinction; for the Scripture uses them both indifferently, even when speaking of the Worship due to God. But I desire that they will shew us some ground for their Distinction, how many degrees of Worship go to make up a *Douleia*, and how many a *Latria*; for as to their External Adoration it is the same Posture when directed to an *Angel*, or *Saints*, as when directed to God, their Affection and Zeal seems likewise the same; nay, and their very External Words are likewise the same, *viz.* asking things of an *Angel* after the same manner as if it were an Independent Being, and consequently his Honour is given to the Creature. As in the *Antiphona* on the Apparition of *Michael* the *Arch Angel he is praid to come and help the People of God.* And in the Feast of the Guardian *Angel*, recommended to all *Catholicks* by *Paul* V. in the last words of the Breviary: *They are praid to defend them in War, that they may not perish in Gods terrible Judgment.* In the Hymn to the Holy Apostles they are praid *to commend the Guilty to be loosed from their Guilt, to heal unsound minds, and to encrease*

Brev. p. 224.

Commun. Apost. p. 29.

crease their Vertues, that when Christ shall come they may be partakers of Eternal Glory. The Reader may plainly see here that, it is not said *Pray to God for us*; which if they did, they were blameable enough; but do it for us, your selves, as if the Angels and Apostles were all Independent Beings. And I am sure such Absolute Worship as that is, cannot even in their own sense be termed *Doulia*; for they cannot express it in higher words to God himself.

2. Those Acts which presuppose in a Creature one of the highest Perfections we can conceive are *Idolatrous*. But so it is that the Invocating of Angels implyes one of the Highest Perfections we can conceive to be in them, for we must imagine that they know when we Invocate them, otherwise if we did not believe them to know and take notice what we said unto them we would not do it. And upon this supposition that they do hear us, we must Attribute to them the highest Knowledge which we can conceive; as suppose so many Persons at the same time pray from the most distant places of the Earth to *St. Michael, Peter, Paul*, &c. we must believe both that they hear those different Prayers of the Persons supposed to be in so distant places, and likewise that they can judge of their sincerity, for we cannot expect to have an Answer of our Prayers without our sincerity be known. Whereas the Scripture plainly says that God is the Judge of Hearts. And pray what higher Notion can we have even of Omniscience it self.

3. That Action which supposes God to be unmindful of his Servants, must needs be highly displeasing to him. But this praying to *Saints* to Intercede for them, supposes God to be unmindful, and that therefore he must be put in mind of it by *Saints* and *Angels*, and likewise that Christ is not so Faithful in his Mediatory Office as he should be. All which are notorious Blasphemies.

It may not be amiss here to set down some instances of the Fathers Opinions, as to the invocation of our Blessed Virgin, &c.

Epiphanius saith, *Maries Body was Holy indeed, but yet not God, she was indeed a Virgin and Honourable, but she was not propounded for Adoration, but herself Worshiped him, who as concerning his Flesh was Born of her.* Contra Colyrid.

Austin saith, *Let not the Worship of dead men be any Religion unto us, because if they have lived Holily, they are not to be accounted of, as that they should seek such Honour, but rather they will have him to be Worshiped of us by whom themselves being illuminated rejoyce, that we should be fellow servants of their reward. They are therefore to be Honoured for Imitation, not to be Worshiped for Religion sake.* De vera Relig. c. ult.

And again, *We honour them with Love, not with Service. Neither do we erect Temples unto them, for they will not have themselves so to be honoured of us, because they know that we our selves being good are the Temples of the High God.* Ibid.

And in another place, *Neither do we Consecrate Temples, Priest-hoods, Holy Rites,* De Civ. Dei, l. 8. c. 27.

Ceremonies, and Sacrifices unto the same Martyrs, seeing not they, but their God is our God &c. We neither Ordain Priests for our Martyrs, nor Offer Sacrifices.

In Rom. c. 1. Ambrose saith, *They are wont to use a miserable Excuse, saying that by these Men we may have Access unto God, as to a King by Earls. Go to, is any Man so Mad I pray you that being forgetful of his own Salvation, he will challange as* *Ibid.* *fit for an Earl the Royalty of a King?* And a little after, *These Men think them not guilty, that give the honour of Gods Name to a Creature, and leaving the Lord, Worship their Fellow Servants.*

Horn. Hist. Eccl. p. 102. &c. We shall now give a short account how Images, were first, brought in as also the Invocation of Saints. And the first that brought in Images is *Paulinus* Bishop of *Nola*, and *Sulpitius Severus*, (although before their time they had in some places Painted Images, as appears from *Epiphanius* Cutting the Vail whereon Christ was Painted) for *Historical* use, or Ornament of their Churches. But there is not the least proof of any *Adoration* given them then; their only use at that time being Historical, Ethical, or Politick. Yet they are blameable for making that use of them; for that Historical use in a little time degenerated into *Idolatry*.

As to the Invocation of Saints, it owes its Original to the *Panegyrick* Orations, of St. *Basil*, *Nyssen*, and *Nazianzen*, who being Great Orators, used several Rhetorical Flourishes in their Declamations, sometimes useing Compellations to the Dead as if they were present before them, and sometimes imploring their Intercession, so that what they did meerly for Eloquence of Speech gave occasion to the Unlearned to fall into that gross Error.

In the days of the Emperour *Philippicus* a New Controversie arose about the *Adoration* of Images; for this Emperour caused to remove the Images of *Christ*, *Mary*, and the *Saints* out of the Churches, and Ordained that none should Worship them; the *Popes* of *Rome* stoutly maintained the *Adoring* of *Images*, and therefore Excommunicated the Emperour. The Original of this Controversie was thus: When *John* a Monothelite Monk, was Elected Patriarch of *Constantinople*, a Council was called there to Examine him as to his Doctrine, where he was Condemn'd of *Heresie*. The *Pope* in Commemoration of this *Act*, caused the *Images* of all those who were present at this Council be set up in the Porch of St. *Peter*: which occasioned a Controversie between the *Greeks* and *Latins*, the former avouching that they should be *Abrogate* as destructive to Piety, and the latter maintaining them. *Leo Isaurus* the Third Emperour of this Name being offended with this abominable *Idolatry* published in Edict *An.* 726. *That none should Worship any Image. He also caused all Images be thrown down, Picturs be Defaced, and the Walls Whitened,*

Gregory

Gregory the Third when he heard thereof Excommunicated *Leo*, who Laughed at his Thundrings, saying, *He* is an *Idolator* and is Excommunicated himself, he was therefore called *Iconomachus*.

To him Succeded *Constantine Copronymus*, a great abhorrerof Images, who also calling the 7*th*. General Council at *Constantinople*, Condemned the Worshipers of Images Idolaters, *&c*. caused all the Images be removed out of Churches and would not so much as suffer them to be used privately.

In the 2*d*. Council of *Nice* 787. by the Influence of *Irene* and her Son *Constantine* the 6*th*. it was decreed that Images should not only be kept for Historical use but also *Adored*, Saluted, *&c* This *Irene* caused the Body of *Constantine Copronimus* be Digged up and publickly Burnt; and caused her Sons *Eyes* be put out, because he threw down some Images.

Upon hearing of the proceedings of this Council *Charles* the Great called a Council at *Frank-fort* 794. of 300 Bishops: whose chief business was the Controversie about *Images*; and they aproved their Historical use, but Condemned the Worshp of them, the 2*d*. *Nicene* Council was rejected, and Writings published against that Pseud-Council, which *Pope Adrian* in vain endeavoured to maintain. Yet in Progress of time it universally prevailed in the Church,

What gross Idolatrys they commit in their Prayers to the Blessed Virgin, the Reader may judge by the Formes they use to Invocate her by. in the present *Roman Breviary* restored according to the Council of *Trent* by several *Popes* you may Read, *Hail Blessed Virgin thou alone have Destroyed all Heresies in the World*, And again, *vouchsafe to let me praise thee O Holy Virgin, and give me strength against thy Enemies*. And in the Hymn frequently used in her Office and particularly on that day she is not ‘ only called the Gate of Heaven, but she is intreated to loose the Bonds ‘ of the Guilty; to give light to the *Blind*, and to drive away our evils, ‘ and to shew herself to be a Mother as in the Mass Book Printed at *Paris*, 1634. ‘ By the Authority of a Mother Command the Redeemer. They pray to her therein ‘ for Purity of Life, and a safe conduct to *Heaven*. Innumerable more might be mentioned, but these may suffice to inform a Judicious Reader more than to accumulate multitudes of *Arguments*. And all this Idolatry committed in the Addresses to her seems to proceed from a gross Notion of an Eternal State, to wit that those External Relations that proceed here from a Married State, such as Husbands and Wives, Parents and Children were in force in that Life of Blessedness; where as our Saviour himself says in his Answer to that unanswerable Objection (*as themselves thought*) of the Sadduces against the Resurrection of the Dead. (*m. Brev. A. 1663. p. 983.*)

The Children of this World Marry and are given in Marriage; But they which shall

which shall be accounted worthy to attain that World and the Resurrection from the Dead, neither Marry nor are given in Marriage---For they are like unto the Angels, &c. Luke 20. 34, 35, 36. And if they are like unto the Angels then undoubtedly all those External Relations that have so much force here are there at an End. Had they considered our Blessed Saviours own words as to her, while one of the Multitude cried, Blessed is the Womb *that bare thee, and the Pap that gave thee Suck*: replying Yea rather Blessed are they that hear the Word of Gods and do it. And it is very Observable that when one came and told him *that his Mother and Brethren stood without desiring to speak with him, he Answered and said unto him that told him, who is my Mother? and who are my Brethren? He stretched forth his hand towards his Disciples, and said, Behold my Mother, and my Brethren. For whosoever shall do the will of my Father which is in Heaven, the same is my Brother and Sister and Mother.* As also that in all places of Scripture where he is brought in answering her he prefaces it with this word *Woman.* By all which 'tis plain that our Saviour did plainly Caveate his Church against those dangerous Errors about his Mother which have since crept into the Christian World to the unspeakable Dishonour of his Name and Stumbling block of *Jews* and *Mahumetans* and *Heathens*, which in all probability shall never be converted to their Lord and Saviour as long as such gross Errors are kept up by those that take upon themselves the Name of Christians. I shall conclude this Discourse in the words of that Religious and Learned Prince K. *James* the First, where speaking of the Controverses between us and the Church of *Rome*, he comes to that point of the Relicts of Saints. *But for the worshiping either of them or Images, I must* (saith he) *account it Damnable Idolatry; and adds, that the Scriptures are so directly, vehemently and punctually against it, as I wonder what Brain of Man, or Suggestion of Satan durst offer it to Christians; and all must be salved with nice and Philosophical Distinctions---, Let them therefore that maintain this Doctrine answer it to Christ at the Latter Day, when he shall accuse them of Idolatry; and then I doubt if he will be paid with such nice and sophistical Distinctions.*

K. James's Works p. 903.

FINIS.